

# **Stakeholder Engagement and Conflicting Discourses in Urban Policy in the Two Rivers Urban Park, Cape Town: An Argumentative Discourse Analysis**

## **Abstract:**

Public participation has the potential to either enhance urban development outcomes or entrench disagreement and frustration. A major challenge for policy-makers is how to understand and then respond to the narratives, metaphors and arguments contributed by stakeholders. In analysing the public participation process for the Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) in Cape Town, this research applies argumentative discourse analysis to capture and analyse multiple dimensions of stakeholder contributions. Arguments, and other linguistic features, were linked to themes distilled from the data. Associating and matching these themes to stakeholder groups identified discourse coalitions. The analysis supports the claim that the development of TRUP involves more than merely a technical discussion. The metaphors, stories and arguments used by participants to discuss the development of TRUP refer to it as an emblematic issue for the development of the city, its history, the history of South Africa and globalisation across the world. The discourse coalitions identified illuminate diverging ideas of how cities ought to respond to the environment, the private sector and residents. Without this knowledge government cannot hope to respond to stakeholders in a manner they will find satisfactory.

*Charlotte Scott*

*Submitted for examination in partial fulfilment of an MPhil in Urban Infrastructure, Design and Management*

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

**Name:** Charlotte Scott

**Student Number:** SCTCHA003

**Course:** MPhil in Urban Infrastructure, Design and Management

### Declaration

I know the meaning of plagiarism and declare that all the work in the document, save for that which is properly acknowledged, is my own. This thesis/dissertation has been submitted to the Turnitin module (or equivalent similarity and originality checking software) and I confirm that my supervisor has seen my report and any concerns revealed by such have been resolved with my supervisor.

**Signature** \_\_\_\_\_

Signed by candidate

**Date** \_\_\_\_\_

19/07/2018

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Urban development in Cape Town.....	2
Cape Town policy and spatial development.....	3
<b>Chapter 2: The Two Rivers Urban Park .....</b>	<b>6</b>
The public participation process.....	8
Stakeholders in and around TRUP.....	9
The co-design of a shared vision.....	12
<b>Chapter 3: Participation and public deliberation .....</b>	<b>15</b>
Political philosophy of public deliberation and public reasons .....	15
Cooperation and conflict resolution through public deliberation .....	17
<b>Chapter 4: Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Discourse and power .....	21
The Argumentative Turn: a school of thought.....	21
Argumentative Discourse Analysis and Discourse Coalition Theory: .....	22
Research Methodology.....	24
<b>Chapter 5: Data Analysis .....</b>	<b>28</b>
Categorical analysis of the data .....	28
Comparing and contrasting the argumentative discourse analysis approach to the TRU(e)-Park process .....	40
<b>Chapter 6: Discourses of Change in TRUP .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Discourse Coalitions .....	44
Testing the literature on power and dominant discourses.....	47
Testing the literature on public deliberation for increased cooperation and understanding .....	48
<b>Chapter 7: Conclusion .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>54</b>

## Frequently Used Abbreviations:

CHTP	Cape Health Technology Park
CoCT	City of Cape Town
OMEV	Oude Molen Eco Village
MGV	Maitland Garden Village
SAAO	South African Astronomical Observatory
SKA	Square Kilometre Array
SUN Development	Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods Development
TRUP	Two Rivers Urban Park
TRUPA	Two Rivers Urban Park Association
WCCNP	Western Cape Council of Nguni People
WCG	Western Cape Government

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Two developments in urban governance and urban analysis underpin this research into one of Cape Town's newest and most challenging urban dreams. The first is an increasing commitment to effective stakeholder representation in the young South African democracy in which citizens deserve and wish to be more than just occasional ballot box participants. The second is the development of discourse-focused methods in policy-making that promise to better capture and assess the perspectives and inputs of diverse stakeholders.

In the past, city planning has often proceeded on the basis of 'expert' and top-down interventions, with minimal, standardised and token public consultation. However over the last few decades there has been growing recognition in cities around the world that planning with citizens is the most moral, sustainable and effective way of directing and managing change. Several techniques have been used to sense and tap into the publics' concerns and aspirations, and to handle expressions of contradictory goals. Often public participation focuses on technical outputs rather than lengthier, more expensive consultation processes that focus on genuine engagement.

The Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) site in Cape Town offers an excellent opportunity to examine a case of genuine public participation. The starting point for the case study is to understand the way stakeholders communicate about urban developments, through arguments, stories and metaphors, as a method for analysing the content of their contributions. This research project is an experiment in analysing a lengthy and detailed public participation process in an effort to produce easily digestible analysis that is both useful to decision-makers and faithful to the voices of stakeholders.

In taking TRUP as a case study, the research relies on a number of simple but powerful ideas in political philosophy and discourse analysis. At its most basic is the assumption that in modern democracies individuals have to get along with other individuals and groups with whom they will fundamentally disagree. As cities become bigger, more complex and more unequal, these disagreements are likely to become bigger.. People who have lived different lives, even in the same city, tend to hold diverging views on right and wrong, what is more important, and who is responsible for doing what.

Even though fundamental disagreements may be unavoidable, public participation - specifically public deliberation - has the potential to produce better development outcomes in cities. Evidence suggests that it has the potential to strengthen civic engagement and improve cooperation between civil society, residents, government and the private sector. However, public deliberation does not always have positive outcomes. It can lead to increased polarisation of views, scepticism, mistrust, and frustration among citizens if they do not feel that their views are adequately being taken into account.

In order to avoid negative outcomes, people who manage public deliberation processes will need methods for collecting, analysing and interpreting the complex data available in public deliberation. This is a complex task because multiple theories and methods are available and the data is often value-laden. This research focuses on methods within the Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis, particularly argumentative discourse analysis. The research will examine a number of research questions:

1. How and in what form do stakeholders engage in public participation for the TRUP site?

2. How can one make sense of the contributions from stakeholders and their significance for decision-makers?
3. What are the advantages or disadvantages of the argumentative discourse analysis approach in comparison to alternative approaches?

## **Urban development in Cape Town**

Sustainable urban development in Cape Town is not just a local matter. It is intimately tied to a wider urban crisis, and the imperative of cities worldwide to anticipate and steer change for environmental and social inclusion. Globally, cities are under pressure to part-fund enormously expensive urban growth and compete for limited national and international sources of finance.

By 2050, Africa's urban population is expected to double, from approximately 1.23 billion people (in 2015) to 2.5 billion people, or 60% of the total population. The United Nations (UN) estimates 71.3% of the South African population will live in urban areas by 2030, reaching nearly 80% by 2050. No African government can afford to ignore the urban transition that is taking place across the continent (Pieterse, Parnell, & Haysom, 2015).

Urbanisation is a challenge but it is also an opportunity for cities. The 'urban dividend' describes an optimal situation where the increasing concentration of an economically active population translates into higher levels of economic activity, greater productivity and higher rates of growth (Ministry of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016). The challenge will be to maximise the potential of urban areas by aligning and integrating investments in transport, human settlements, infrastructure networks and land-use regulations.

In South African cities and towns there has been an increase in the importance of the formal property market since 1994. This growth has been vital to the tax-based income of municipalities, whose budgets are heavily constrained, but the unconstrained market has also undermined access to urban opportunity, reinforced inefficient urban sprawl and failed to provide affordable housing and shelter for all. Uneven growth in land values and limited access to the formal property market have entrenched profound social divisions and translated into very little racial diversity in working class and poor areas (Ministry of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016).

South Africa's Integrated Urban Development Framework (IUDF) (2016) acknowledges that urban growth and development can create and amplify risks. Cities are expanding rapidly, with a shortfall of well-located housing pushing new settlements into unsafe areas, driving poverty, and placing strain on ecologically sensitive wetlands and floodplains. Resilience, in all its facets, is crucial for reducing the risks and impact of natural and human-made crises. Resilience, in this general sense, is the ability to recover quickly from adverse events (Ministry of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs, 2016).

The IUDF argues that South Africa needs to reduce the exposure of vulnerable residents to climate-related extreme events and other socio-economic or environmental shocks. Adaptive capacity will become increasingly important as South African cities face an increase in frequency and intensity of climate-related hazards and disasters over the next decades (Crawford, 2017). The City of Cape Town is particularly vulnerable to sea level rise, flooding and fires. Despite the fact that South African cities have achieved significant service delivery and development gains since 1994, including increased access to sanitation, electricity and housing, apartheid spatial patterns have not been reversed. Paradoxically, the post-1994 scramble to provide housing and services in line with electoral

expectations, limited budget and capacity meant that apartheid spatial patterns have been further entrenched and are now even harder to reverse than in 1994 (Crawford, 2017).

The City of Cape Town remains considerably segregated by race, and by class. Postcode-by-postcode, it is arguably an entirely different city. This is a direct result of historical planning patterns, but persists through the City's current planning, housing and service delivery implementation despite growing civil society protests about on-going displacement from inner-city neighbourhoods like Woodstock and Salt River. The City has since made several political commitments towards implementing affordable, well-located housing. But the vast majority of new government housing is currently being built far from employment centres, in areas with poor social services. The result is more urban sprawl, a growing spatial mismatch between jobs and housing, and additional strain on a weak and expensive public transport system (Merten, 2016).

Land-use patterns in the City are remarkably low density by international comparison, even in comparison with that of other developing cities (World Bank, 2016). South African cities, including Cape Town, also have a high degree of informality compared with developing cities in Asia and South America (Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development Staff, 2016). High levels of service inefficiency, low cost-recovery and wasteful use of scarce resources (especially land, infrastructure networks, and water) characterize Cape Town. Not only is the city currently in the grips of a severe natural drought, it also struggles to maintain the health and ecological integrity of its urban rivers in the context of informality and urban industrial waste along their banks (Grobicki, 2001).

There are a number of diverse prevailing discourses about the City. These are apparent in the media, the City's policy documents, legal frameworks, civil society statements and chit chat at the corner spaza or hipster café. A post-apartheid South African city is to some Capetonians a world-class tourist destination. To some it is drought ridden, cash strapped, sprawling, violent and divided. The extremes of the Cape Town urban spectrum range from a city that is well run and beautiful, to one that is corrupt and racist. The challenge for urban planners and policy-makers is to implement development that aligns with multiple discourses and that can achieve buy-in from diverse residents who fundamentally disagree about what their city is and what it represents.

## **Cape Town policy and spatial development**

To get a snapshot of the context governing the TRUP site, this section provides brief descriptions of five levels of policy within which TRUP is embedded and with which it must align.

### ***National level: Integrated Urban Development Framework (2016)***

At the national level South Africa's cities are guided by the 2016 Integrated urban Development Framework (IUDF). Its overall aim is spatial transformation by steering urban growth towards a sustainable growth model of compact, connected and coordinated cities and towns. IUDF is influenced and informed by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) adopted by the UN Assembly in 2015. And at a continental level, the IUDF is informed by the African Union's 'Agenda 2063' and its strategic goals.

The IUDF argues that South African cities and towns need to be more inclusive and create more employment while investing in social protection, education, healthcare and training. To thrive, cities will need to anticipate the changing nature of global economic competitiveness, as international measures come into force to deal with climate change. It also argues that



cities need a new governance social compact, giving citizens more scope to shape their own lives, and improving public services and the accountability of public institutions.

***Provincial level: Cape Town Central City Regeneration Program (2010)***

On a provincial level, the Western Cape Government, through its Cape Town Central City Regeneration Program (CTCCRP), similarly aims for Cape Town to become a city that serves the needs of all its citizens, as one of the best cities in the world. More specifically, the CTCCRP highlights the need to leverage private sector investment, capacity and expertise, and to generate an income stream to finance property development. The programme emphasizes the development, management, and maintenance of public land to facilitate economic activity, social cohesion, and environmental sustainability (Western Cape Government, 2010).

***Municipal level: City of Cape Town Municipal Spatial Development Framework (draft 2017) and Cape Town Urban Design Policy (2013)***

At a municipal level, the MSDF is a 10-year vision for the City of Cape Town. It is currently under review to ensure it aligns with the 2017-2022 Integrated Development Plan and the Spatial Planning Land Use Management Act 2013. It emphasizes that workers travel long distances in order to access economic and social opportunities, making transportation costly and time consuming. Infrastructure creates hard barriers to access to the city and further fragments it. The city is characterized by inaccessible neighbourhood units, as a result, which are separated by natural buffers. The MSDF speaks directly to the entrenched legacy of apartheid spatial planning and to the imperative of countering the fragmented urban form along race and class lines. The MSDF focuses on restructuring the city, so that opportunities for housing, transit, recreation and work are available to all in an equitable manner (City of Cape Town, 2017).

The Cape Town Urban Design Policy (2013) was mentioned during the stakeholder workshops as a key guiding policy for the development of TRUP. Its function is to “guide the design process and formulation of development proposals so as to address the segregated nature of the city inherited from apartheid and make Cape Town safer, more economically prosperous, socially inclusive and environmentally sustainable” (City of Cape Town, 2013: 3)

***District level: Table Bay District Plan (2012)***

The City of Cape Town is divided into districts, each with its own spatial development plan. These plans seek to effect the Cape Town Municipal Spatial Development Framework at a sub-metropolitan scale. The Two Rivers Urban Park falls under the Table Bay District Plan (TBDP) and it is against this policy that developments within the district are assessed. New developments must be in accordance with the governing spatial plan. The TBDP objective is to facilitate the establishment of a Multi-Purpose Metropolitan Park, which preserves open space. Simultaneously, the TBDP aims to prevent the deterioration of the natural environment as a result of over-development.

The TBDP argues that, as a civic precinct, TRUP should improve access to public facilities and upgrade the public environment, contributing to the development of a continuous system of green belts from Table Bay to False Bay as a nature destination for a range of communities. The plan also acknowledges that making this vision a reality will require considerable investment, but that the cost is worth it for the value of the facilities the area could provide to areas like Salt River, Woodstock, District Six and the CBD where open space is limited.

***Precinct level: Two Rivers Urban Park Contextual Framework and Phase 1 Management Plan:***

In 2003 the City adopted the Contextual Framework for TRUP as a policy document. Its objective was to act as a framework for conservation, rehabilitation and management of the open space, sensitive ecological systems and historically significant sites within the TRUP area.

In the contextual analysis the framework highlights the central role that parks have and continue to play in cities. However they tend to be thoughtlessly established or inadequately designed for present day uses, now mere green open spaces. Poor planning has resulted in too many parks, poorly designed and increasingly expensive to maintain. The framework, while aspirational in its vision for TRUP, was more predictive in its warning that Parks tend to be too expensive and struggle to realise their potential in the city, a fate which TRUP would not escape in the years following the 2003 Contextual Framework.

Many of the specific opportunities and constraints identified under the 2003 Contextual Framework remain relevant today, and particularly inform the starting point for many for the stakeholders who participated in the 2016 stakeholder engagement process.

Although the framework went through an extensive process of participation to develop buy-in from and ownership of the policy, since its adoption in 2003 the policy has become out-dated. According to a 2016 presentation from the City of Cape Town, the framework was never a strong guiding document because the contextual analysis had not been done well and the implementation strategy lacked funding. Furthermore, since its development the precinct boundary for the TRUP site has changed to include a significant section of the Ndabeni industrial area. Accordingly, the 2003 Contextual Framework needs updating.

What is noticeably lacking from the 2003 framework is any discussion of new green field developments. It does not exclude this possibility explicitly, except to emphasise the importance of preserving the green open space. Its historical analysis of the area emphasises more recent uses of the land for farming and the buildings and views that remain to be protected for heritage. It does not include much information on the use of the land by the original Khoisan inhabitants and or more recent links to historical events such as the incarceration of King Cetshwayo and King Langalibalele.

The content of the 2016-2017 public participation discussions, which will be discussed in more detail below, is therefore a significant departure from the existing policy framework for the Two Rivers Urban Park. It is a crucial, unique contribution towards advancing policy frameworks governing the precinct, and therefore its content should be incorporated into an updated contextual framework or local spatial development framework for the area. The task of translating the content from the public participation process into a format that could be used for policymaking is the purpose of this research.

## Chapter 2: The Two Rivers Urban Park

The Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) is a 300 ha site in the City of Cape Town in which the Black and the Liesbeeck rivers converge. It includes large stretches of open spaces on either side of the M5 highway and is surrounded by both residential neighbourhoods (Observatory, Pinelands, Maitland) and industrial and commercial areas (Ndabeni, Black River Parkway and others).



Figure 1: Boundaries and precincts of the Two Rivers Urban Park. Colour coding explained in main text (Source: Western Cape Provincial Government Tender S174/14 Provision of Professional Services to undertake Urban Planning, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, Environmental and Heritage Studies for the Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) Project, Cape Town (City of Cape Town, 2013).

TRUP embraces a number of diverse land-uses in and amongst the green open space: Alexandra and Valkenberg Psychiatric Hospitals for the mentally ill and forensic services; Oude Molen Eco-village; the South African Astronomical Observatory; the River Club and its golf driving range. It is a mix of endangered biodiversity, close-knit communities who have built their community infrastructure from the ground up, high-security healthcare facilities, and private sector-oriented conferencing facilities and golfing. The site is very unusual in Cape Town.

A number of properties in the site are owned by the Western Cape Government (WCG), including Alexandra Psychiatric Hospital, Valkenberg Psychiatric Hospital and Oude Molen Eco-Village (highlighted in blue in Figure 1). The City of Cape Town owns properties such as Maitland Garden Village, the Maitland Abattoir Site and land within the Black and Liesbeek river floodplain corridors (highlighted in yellow in Figure 1). Transnet (a South African State Owned Company for rail, port and pipeline management) previously owned the River Club site (highlighted in red in Figure 1) but recently sold it to a private owner, Liesbeek Leisure Property Trust. Other than this, privately owned land is located mainly in the Ndabeni Triangle and pockets of Maitland Garden Village (highlighted in green in Figure 1). The area is served by the Southern and Cape Flats railway lines and has access to at least five railway stations (marked as black dots in Figure 1).

The open space surrounding the two rivers is subject to periodic flooding on 5, 10, 50 and 100-year timescales. Reportedly the area is due for a 1/100-year flood in the next few years. The area has been developed significantly since it last experienced a 1/100 year flood. The rivers were canalised and a bridge and other structures built within the open space. The hard infrastructure which now exists has disrupted usual flooding patterns, although the exact impact of this on a 1/100 year flood is still to be determined. Water quality in both rivers is poor and there is not much hope of using rivers like the Liesbeek or Black as a water source for the City. The water quality is unlikely to improve even to the point at which swimming might be safe. However it is an important water source for biodiversity along the river banks and has the potential to support water activities such as boating or canoeing if the water quality is improved.

A number of civic organisations, such as Friends of the Liesbeek, have dedicated time and attention to improving the quality of the river and returning some sections to their natural state before canalisation. The Friends' monitoring of river recuperation has documented an increase in bird life and frogs, an indication that the area is regenerating.

The city's electricity and sewage capacity for the area in TRUP is particularly limited. Traffic is already congested in the surrounding neighbourhoods. Much like other areas of the city, the surrounding areas are not dense but the site will face difficulty accommodating significant additional households in the area unless some services are off-grid.

### ***Heritage in the TRUP site***

The confluence of the Black and Liesbeek Rivers is believed to be one of the earliest sites of human settlement in the Cape during the pre-colonial and colonial periods and has significant heritage value. It includes a number of tangible and intangible aspects of heritage and culture in the TRUP site such as pastoral activity and river crossings as well as more recent history of forced population removals.

Initial findings from a draft baseline study of the heritage in the area indicates that the site was used for summer grazing by the Gorinhauqua and Goringchoqua during the pre-colonial period (Western Cape Government, 2016). The Dutch East India Company placed barriers along the site to limit access to fertile soil and important water systems to control access to these resources. It was also during the Dutch Colonial period that individual tenure was first granted on the site, introducing private property ownership. Several windmills were developed for early industrial use in the agricultural area. There remain the Oude Molen ('Old Mill') and Nieuwe Molen ('New Mill') names from this time and remnants of these mills remains on the site.

The Astronomical Observatory (established in 1972) was the first use of the site for scientific institutional purposes. Shortly after this the site became central to medical purposes that were thought to require distance and separation from society in the form of the Valkenberg

Psychiatric Hospital and the Alexandra Institute. The Valkenberg East Psychiatric Hospital was used for racially segregating the medical institution whereas Maitland Garden Village was used on the site to provide racially segregated housing (Melanie Attwell and Associates & Arcon Heritage and Design, 2016).

High-density housing was traditionally only on the periphery in Observatory and Salt River. Over time, the landscape changed as the city around it transformed. Railway transportation links were built and historic farming areas such as Malta Farm and Vaarschedruft were eventually lost to development. Areas previously thought unsuitable for development due to flooding were developed for recreational use such as the Hartleyvale stadium and sports fields.

The TRUP site, and the vast amount of land it covers, remains a contested site for the heritage it represents in Cape Town. Prior to the most recent baseline heritage study the significance of the site for the history of the Khoisan and Nguni people had been neglected, as had its importance in the colonization of the area. In 2018, South Africa is still reeling from the impact of land expropriation across generations and the history of the TRUP site is particularly symbolic of that impact. The more recent history of the site is no less contested, as the City faces increasing pressure from residents and civil society for more affordable housing, equitable access to services, and pushback against the selling off of state-owned properties to the private sector.

### **The public participation process**

In January 2015 the Western Cape Government released a tender for professional services to undertake urban planning, precinct planning, engineering, environmental and heritage studies for the Two Rivers Urban Park area (Western Cape Government, 2015). The tender was part of a partnership initiative for the development of the TRUP area between the CoCT and the Western Cape Government (WCG). The stated intention was to enhance the area's natural and cultural resources and develop TRUP for residential, commercial, institutional, manufacturing and recreational activities. These aimed at generating a wide range of housing, recreation, business and employment opportunities.

A multi-disciplinary consortium, led by a private planning firm (Nisa Mammon and Associates: Planners and Designers) was awarded the tender to deliver a 'package of plans' for the TRUP area. This included a series of specialist studies such as a heritage baseline study, flood modeling and mitigation, and market potential analysis. Precincts of particular interest would have 'precinct plans', including Oude Molen Eco-Village, Ndabeni and Alexandra Psychiatric Hospital. The consortium would deliver a hierarchy of plans and a flexible framework to guide future public and private investment and development in TRUP. Notably, this included the facilitation of a public participation and engagement process, to be led and delivered by a consultancy within the consortium.

As part of this public participation and engagement process, the consultancy, Sustainable Urban Neighbourhoods (SUN) Development engaged with a broad range of stakeholders. It targeted those considered to be directly affected by the proposed new framework plan for the TRUP site: the TRUP Association, the Oude Molen Forum and the Western Cape Council of Nguni People; landowners in and around the site; private businesses operating in the area; civic and ratepayers associations from surrounding areas such as Mowbray, Pinelands, Maitland, Observatory, Kensington, Kewtown, Langa and Athlone.

In parallel, SUN Development engaged with different levels of government across different departments during the on-going public participation process. This primarily included sub-councils and their wards, provincial government and line department representatives, and the City of Cape Town and its line department representatives.

Stakeholders were initially identified by SUN Development, and primarily included those stakeholders who resided or did business in or around the site. However, over the list of participating stakeholders expanded, often at the request of current stakeholders, to include individuals and organisations who expressed an interest in the site, including research institutions and traditional leaders among others.

While SUN Development held some interviews and meetings with individual stakeholders, a series of co-design workshops were the primary vehicle for stakeholder engagement. Between February 2016 and February 2017, SUN Development met with stakeholders at thirteen workshops, usually two hours long, occasionally longer. Attendance registers show that while the range of stakeholders attending the workshops broadened as the process unfolds, the same associations and individuals attended consistently, an important component for discourse analysis of the content. The original process was intended to include only four workshops early in 2016 but was extended to thirteen. SUN Development termed the process, and its outputs, as part of the “TRU(e)-Park” project. Data gathering for the analysis in this thesis involved participation in these workshops, as well as attending monthly meetings of the TRUP Association. These often focussed on reflecting on and responding to the workshops as they unfolded over the year.

## **Stakeholders in and around TRUP**

Over the weeks and months of the TRU(e)-Park process, a range of stakeholders attended the workshops, including university students and researchers and members of the concerned public. Twelve principal organisations emerged as active and stable participants in the process, attending the majority of the workshops, two of which were city and provincial level government. Some were private businesses with an interest in submitting a development proposal in the area (usually just one representative in attendance) while others were civic associations or collective civic associations with a constant presence of two or three attendees at each workshop. A number of other attendees came and went over the weeks. Others were ratepayers’ or residents’ associations, which had a large presence at the meetings and were very active in following up on minutes released from the workshops and encouraging a larger group of four or five people to attend each meeting. Below is an outline of key stakeholder groups which contributed consistently to the process and the development of key discourses. It is not entirely exhaustive of stakeholders but covers the vast majority of contributions and participants.

### ***Two Rivers Urban Park Association***

As the official mouthpiece and convener for civil society organisation in the TRUP site, the TRUP Association (TRUPA) was particularly active in the TRU(e)-Park process. TRUPA has members from a broad range of organisations, including the other stakeholders listed here. But beyond that it also interacted directly with organisations like the Development Action Group and independently interacted with the City of Cape Town (CoCT) and the Western Cape Government (WCG) on a number of occasions. TRUPA meets monthly to discuss the developments in the TRUP site. Its role was originally established as part of implementing the 2003 Contextual Framework for TRUP. Notable organisations within the TRUPA include Friends of the Liesbeek, Raapenberg Bird Sanctuary and the Pinelands and Observatory Ratepayers Associations.

### ***Oude Molen Eco-Village***

Oude Molen Eco Village (OMEV), situated between Life Vincent Pallotti Hospital and Maitland Garden Village, was started in 1997 by a group of social entrepreneurs using empty buildings of the Valkenberg East hospital site. The village has since evolved into a

diverse community including 42 small enterprises providing approximately 200 full-time employment opportunities (Oude Molen Eco Village Tenants Association, 2016). Enterprises range from backpacker accommodation, music studios, equestrian activities, frail-care services, metal, wood and craft workshops, public pool and braai facilities, urban agriculture, educational, social and recreational amenities and non-profit services to youth and the elderly (World Design Capital, 2014).

OMEV aims to provide affordable space to emerging small enterprises to create employment opportunities, empower youth, promote urban agriculture and offer a variety of social and recreational activities to surrounding communities and local and international visitors while producing revenue for WCG, which owns the land. A proposal titled the “Oude Molen Eco Village Future Development Proposal” was recognised as a World Design Capital (WDC) 2014 project. OMEV notes this as affirming the innovative and socially relevant nature of OMEV.

### ***The Robin Trust***

The Robin Trust is a faith-based non-profit organisation that offers care facilities and trains carers. It is located in OMEV. It offers training for new carers and nurses who can train at the organisation. They are a care facility for post-surgery recovery as well as frail care facilities for the elderly.

### ***BIOVAC***

BIOVAC is a private company that runs the Cape Health Technology Park - a research and innovation hub that develops medical technology such as surgical implants and vaccines. It is located across from OMEV, close to the border of Maitland Garden Village. It has been recognised for its role as one of the few African-based organisations that develop and produce vaccines for the continent in the midst of a shortage of antigens necessary to tackle HIV and TB (Klugman, 2017).

The Cape Health Technology Park plans to expand its operation, and at the time of the TRU(e)-Park process planned to apply to the WCG to use some of the fire-damaged buildings, and others, on the current OMEV site to do so.

### ***The River Club***

The River Club is a privately owned development with conferencing facilities, a restaurant and a golf driving range. The River Club has expressed a desire to re-energise its facilities. Half way through the year of workshops it released a development proposal, in partnership with Zenprop, for public comment as one of the first steps towards rezoning the land for development. The development proposals includes increasing the built footprint of the land into the green space beyond the driving range for enhanced conference facilities, office space and accommodation. It also included raising the level of the land in order to build such facilities (Dentlinger, 2016).

### ***The Square Kilometre Array (SKA), South Africa***

The SKA is a large multi radio telescope project which aims to push the boundaries of our knowledge of the universe. SKA South Africa is a business unit within the National Research Foundation and a legal entity established in terms of the National Research Foundation. In 2012 SKA International awarded the majority of the telescopes and resources for the project to SKA South Africa. This SKA project will build on the development of MeerKAT, a 64-dish array for collecting data in the Karoo, funded by the South African government. The conditions of the bid are that a new Science Data Processing Facility is built in Cape Town, as well as a SKA Engineering and Operations Centre. SKA South Africa was considering using some property in the TRUP site for the SKA Engineering and Operations Centre. At the time, the National Research Foundation had requested it be located in a building and



land that is owned by the NRF. The NRF currently owns land at the Observatory, as well as at the entrance to the River Club. Both were being considered for feasibility at time of the TRU(e)-Park process.

### ***The Royal House of the Khoisan Nation***

The Khoisan, including both the Khoi Khoi and the San peoples, are the oldest known inhabitants of southern Africa, having lived in the area for at least two thousand years. They are an ethno-linguistic group that has been marginalised throughout much of South African history. The arrival of European settlers in 1652 led to the Khoisan losing most of their land, which has never been returned to them, and forced into wage labour that was akin to slave labour. The Land Restitution Act of 1994 does not currently make provision for land which was taken before 1913, so there are no current legal avenues for the restitution of much of Khoisan land that was lost (Mitchell, 2012). The history of the Khoisan people has been an oral history, often unavailable in text. Some of the richness of this history has been lost over generations. However, there is clear evidence that apart from being an important ancestral grazing land and source of water, a number of important historical figures and events are closely connected to the land inside the TRUP site (Melanie Attwell and Associates & Arcon Heritage and Design, 2016). King Khoebaha Calvin Cornelius III is the Head of the Royal House of the Khoisan Nation. He presented during the workshops and represented the Khoisan people, referred to as the First Nation in this thesis, as in all documentation relating to the TRU(e)-Park process.

### ***Western Cape Council of Nguni People (WCCNP)***

The Nguni People is a collective name for a number of ethno-linguistic groups with hundreds of tribes, including the Xhosa, Zulu and Ndebele, and largely residing in southern Africa. The Nguni people migrated southward from more northern areas of the African continent, splitting into distinct groups as they settled further south, arriving in South African and were established in the country long before the arrival of Dutch colonialists (Mazel & Stewart, 1987).

The TRUP site and its surrounding areas have particular importance for the history and heritage of the Nguni people, as highlighted by Lungelo Nokwaza, Chairperson of the Council, who presented during the workshops. Both King Langalibalele, released from Robben Island in 1875, and King Cetshwayo, once lived in Pinelands (Melanie Attwell and Associates & Arcon Heritage and Design, 2016). Black workers were moved from District Six to Ndabeni in 1901, and again forcefully removed to Langa as early as 1923 (Saunders, 1979). Despite this, there are currently no direct Nguni land claims made in TRUP or the neighbouring areas. There is, however, a desire from the WCCNP to establish an Nguni presence on the site to commemorate its significance and to teach others about the culture and heritage of the Nguni people.

### ***Maitland Garden Village***

Maitland Garden Village, represented by the Garden Village Ratepayers Association, is a community located between OMEV, Alexandra Hospital and the M5. Influenced by the “garden city” movement in the United Kingdom, the area was established for coloured workers in 1918 (Melanie Attwell and Associates & Arcon Heritage and Design, 2016). It consists of a formally designed self-contained, residential precinct centred on a public open space along with a number of community facilities. The buildings have a consistency in terms of scale and design and have views of Devil’s Peak. The Garden Village Residents’ Association is a non-party political organisation of volunteers committed to promoting interests of all the residents within the area and to build community spirit.



### ***Valkenberg Psychiatric Hospital***

Valkenberg is a large government-funded psychiatric hospital located in TRUP. It includes a forensic psychiatric unit which is dedicated to providing psychiatric assessments of defendants who have been referred to the hospital by the courts. It also caters for the rehabilitation of mentally disordered offenders and is a learning institution for students and medical practitioners. Valkenberg has at different times in history been considered an enlightened institution on progressive treatment for mental illness and a cold, intimidating institution that was located in the TRUP site precisely because it was thought that mental illness required removal from society and was to be held behind barriers and exclusion. At the time of the TRU(e)-Park process the hospital was undergoing a revitalisation of its site and buildings.

### **The co-design of a shared vision**

The purpose of the thirteen 2016-2017 stakeholder workshops, as articulated by SUN Development, was to co-design a shared vision of the TRUP site through the development of four co-design tools. The process of engagement shifted during the months the workshops were held. Originally, the purpose was to have the outputs feed into a new contextual framework for TRUP. Participants at initial meetings in February 2016 were hesitant of the public participation process, of the organising institution (SUN Development), of the City, of the Province and of the Manifesto itself. Stakeholders who attended brought with them their own negative perceptions of governance and development in the City of Cape Town.

To achieve buy-in from stakeholders the process had to change. SUN Development extended the process from the original four workshops, and opened up the floor for the City, Province and prospective developers to present their vision and proposals to stakeholders. Over the next few weeks more and more stakeholder groups requested to present at the meetings themselves. While stakeholders welcomed input from City, Province and developers, they also wanted to talk about what the Two Rivers Urban Park meant to them. Over the next few months, more workshops were added and presentations were heard from stakeholders from almost all the surrounding areas of the TRUP on its history, its potential, its value, its meaning and its vulnerability. The final list of workshops and their content is listed in Box 1 below.

### **Box 1: Co-design workshops held during the TRU(e)-Park process.**

**Workshop 1** - 25 February 2016: Introduction to the TRU-Park project, followed by a question and answer session.

**Workshop 2** - 10 March 2016: The making of the TRU-Park Manifesto

**Workshop 3** - 31 March 2016: Mapping exercise capturing the stakeholders' knowledge, through a series of maps indicating constraints and opportunities of the site.

**Workshop 4**: 25 April 2016: Presentations of the different visions for the TRU-Park or parts of it, by stakeholders groups and provincial and municipal civil servants.

**Workshop 5a and 5b** - 12 and 19 May 2016: Presentations of the baseline studies by the professional team members.

**Workshop 6**: 28 May 2016: Walkabout on the TRU-Park site, along the Liesbeek and at the SA Astronomic Observatory and the surrounding wetland, accompanied by a series of micro stories by different stakeholders and experts.

**Workshop 7**: 9 June 2016: Presentations of possible future scenarios for the TRU-Park by the professional team and a stakeholder group [TRUP Association], followed by group discussions and preliminary evaluation of each scenario against the Manifesto.

**Workshop 8a and 8b**: 7 July and 11 August 2016: Presentations by different stakeholders, including Maitland Garden Village, Robin Trust, Western Cape Council of Nguni People, and the First Nation leader, King Khoebaha Cornelius.

**Workshop 9a and 9b**: 3 and 10 November 2016: Presentations of the specialist studies including: Environmental studies [Avifauna and flora, aquatic studies], heritage study, Watercourse and flood modelling, Engineering Assumptions.

**Workshop 10**: 18 February 2017 Co-design workshop

Source: adapted from Co-design Workshop Resource Sketchbook (SUN Development 2017: 19)

SUN Development included in their stakeholder engagement process a number of co-design tools for creating a TRU(e)-Park Vision. The primary tool for developing a shared vision with stakeholders through which to guide further development in the site was the manifesto. The manifesto is a set of 10 design principles, designed by SUN Development after the very first workshop, reviewed and edited by participants at subsequent workshops. The compilation of a manifesto aimed to support the co-design process by establishing the overarching essential objectives for the future development of the TRUP site. SUN Development emphasised that they had aligned the manifesto with the global urban agenda, the provincial and municipal strategies and goals, as well as direct stakeholders inputs. The role of the manifesto is to guide the decision making process regarding the future of the TRUP. The intent is for the manifesto's objectives to be unfolded in a set of programmatic and spatial principles, guiding the precinct planning and design process in detail.

As the workshops unfolded, SUN Development also conducted a resource mapping exercise with stakeholders. This included time during workshops for stakeholders to iteratively contribute to maps of the area. The result was a compilation of a series of 'constraints and opportunities' maps aimed to capture the stakeholders' knowledge and perception of the site, as well as their visions and ideas for the future.

Finally, SUN Development worked with the team of professional and stakeholders to design a number of scenarios for the site. The construction of scenarios aimed to explore possible

futures for the TRUP site, testing the socio-spatial implications of each scenario. The use of scenarios was intended to enable stakeholders to envision different possible futures, as well as offer engineers and specialists a starting point to test the relative implications. The technical team led by SUN Development presented stakeholders with two diverging scenarios after stakeholder presentations. A number of stakeholders, however, were dissatisfied with the way in which this captured their input into the process and their key concerns for the site. A third scenario was developed by a group of stakeholders, lead chiefly by the TRUP Association, and presented as an alternative.

As the process shifted during 2016, it was eventually decided by City and Province that the Local Spatial Development Framework (LSDF) for the TRUP area would be revised officially. An official public participation process would have to be followed to that end. This would allow plans for the areas to amend higher order plans where necessary, such as the Table Bay District Plan and others.

However, the outputs from the TRU(e)-park process were intended to feed into that process, not to be forgotten. In which case, the question this thesis asks is what policy-makers should learn from the TRU(e)-park process. How ought one to make sense of months and months of discussions with numerous civic associations, technical experts, academic institutions, government and private developers?

### ***Positionality of the research in the TRU(e)-Park project***

For the purposes of this thesis, the process of collecting data and analysing the inputs from stakeholders for this thesis was done independently of the SUN Development team or any of the other participants in the workshops. The research was not commissioned by anyone. At the first workshop in February 2016, permission was sought from the organisers and participants to record and analyse the proceedings. My participation in the proceedings was as an independent observer and interested resident. I did not actively shape the proceedings or contribute to the development of the co-design tools. I attempted as much as possible to blend into the background, not drawing particular attention to myself beyond simple introductions.

Any recordings, transcripts or early analysis was intentionally kept confidential, viewed only by myself. I have attributed direct quotes to some individuals only under the condition that participants were aware that their comments were attributed to them and that those individuals were speaking in their capacity as representatives of an organisation, not in their personal capacity. Minutes from the proceedings were circulated by SUN Development to all attendees and provided an opportunity for participants to challenge the record of their comments. Corrections and clarifications were handled at subsequent meetings.

## Chapter 3: Participation and public deliberation

The key argument of this thesis is that one of the most valuable resources to mine from the TRU(e)-Park process, and one not clearly captured in the outputs to date, are the individual stories told by participants and the arguments behind stakeholder positions on key components of future development in the site. The importance of language, stories and metaphors in the development of policy is no longer a novel concept, although it still challenges dominant approaches to policy analysis that emphasise interests, such as the Advocacy Coalition Framework (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993).

What follows is a broad exploration of the relevant schools of thought for public participation, with an emphasis on language and argumentation. This thesis draws on four intersecting fields of literature that examine different perspectives on the value of public deliberation and discourse analysis. The first is an examination of the political philosophy of public deliberation and its role in the deliberative democratic theory of John Rawls and Jurgen Habermas. The philosophy of Habermas in particular has been key to the development of the field of discourse-based approaches to public policy. Habermas and Rawls both champion the idea that the use of reason is the determining factor in the legitimacy and stability of modern democracies. They present a number of compelling arguments on the role of public reason. The second is an overview of empirical studies on the impact of public deliberation on development outcomes, which test the assumptions of Rawls and Habermas and their implications for the TRU(e)-Park process.

In Chapter Four, the thesis discusses the third field of literature, the philosophy of Michel Foucault on the use of language and power in society. Similar to Habermas, Foucault's philosophy is a key foundation for the development of discourse analysis as a school of thought. Finally, Chapter Four examines the school of thought known as Argumentative Discourse Analysis. It draws on the theory of Habermas, Rawls and Foucault in a range of methodologies that all place emphasis on the role of language and discourse in understanding policy and participation. From the range of methodologies available, this research focuses specifically on the methodology developed by Maarten Hajer, to analyse the TRUP participation process.

### Political philosophy of public deliberation and public reasons

Modern societies include a multitude of varying systems of belief, philosophy, religion and morality. According to Rawls (1997) individuals have their own *comprehensive doctrines*, a complete system of beliefs on life: religion, virtue, happiness, right and wrong. Comprehensive doctrines need not necessarily be rational, as individuals can hold conflicting beliefs and/or be unaware of ill-informed opinions they may hold. However they are comprehensive in the sense that they are overarching beliefs and ideas that govern how individuals make decisions in all areas of their life.

In a modern democratic society that values tolerance and reason, Rawls argues that we must acknowledge that our beliefs are the result of our different experiences in life, our different ways of interpreting large amounts of complex evidence and our different ways of weighing a variety of moral principles. Reasonable citizens, Rawls argues, will not want to impose their own comprehensive doctrine on other citizens who are also reasonable as one cannot act as if one's own comprehensive doctrine is the only reasonable way to live (Rawls, 1996).

The challenge then, is that there can only be one authority by which everyone abides. Or in this case, there has to be a final decision with regards to development in the TRUP, and

everyone has to abide by this decision. Whether individuals accept a decision on an issue they value, which conflicts with their own beliefs on the topic, depends on how much legitimacy the final decision carries. Therefore, Rawls' liberalism as a political doctrine has as its over-arching aims both legitimacy and stability. In order to be legitimate, the liberal state is one that offers reasons for its decisions which all reasonable citizens could accept. Stability is secured by finding a way of reaching reasoned agreement among citizens even when sharp disagreements threaten to lead to conflict and unrest. Under political liberalism, citizens ought to be able to see themselves as the authors of the laws they live by, being able to engage discursively with other citizens to reach consensus on the coercive rules of their own society (Rawls, 1996).

Accordingly, citizens engaged in certain political activities have a *duty of civility* to be able to justify their decisions on fundamental political issues by reference only to public values and public standards (Rawls, 1997). The duty to justify one's political decisions with public reasons is a moral duty, not a legal one: it is a duty of civility. Citizens owe one another good reasons, reasons that are clear to all, and that everyone can understand and relate to.

There are many similarities between Jurgen Habermas' political philosophy of deliberative democracy and Rawls' political liberalism (Rawls, 1997). With both theorists strongly influenced by the work of Immanuel Kant, there is considerable overlap in their aims. Habermas' contribution to political philosophy is vast, and complex, but for the purposes of this research, it is worth highlighting his ideas around discourse ethics and the role of deliberation in democratic society.

Habermas' early work on Discourse Ethics looked at Kant's famous 'Categorical Imperative' and argued that instead of unilaterally deciding on what is a universal maxim for moral action by oneself, maxims should be submitted to everyone so that maxims can be discursively tested for universality. Habermas thus developed a proceduralist account of democracy, which centralises political autonomy as self-legislation through the public use of reason by free and equal citizens (Habermas, 1995). As in Rawls' philosophy, citizens must understand themselves as the authors of the laws that protect their rights. Habermas argues for a *democratic principle of legitimacy*: "only those statutes may claim legitimacy that can meet with the assent of all citizens in a discursive process of legislation that in turn has been legally constituted" (McCarthy, 1994).

Habermas' philosophy is perhaps one of the most important contributions to a significant body of work within democratic theory that designates public deliberation as a cornerstone of participatory democracy and representative government (Habermas, 1996). There is no clear consensus on a definition of "public deliberation", however I have adopted an often-used definition by Gastil (2000):

"[Public deliberation is] discussion that involves judicious argument, critical listening, and earnest decision-making... [F]ull deliberation includes a careful examination of a problem or issue, the identification of possible solutions, the establishments or reaffirmation of evaluative criteria, and the use of criteria in identifying an optimal solution".

Habermas' theory has been utilised in the field of urban development as a kind of "planning through debate" whereby different stakeholders achieve consensus on planning matters through rational argumentation. His work in this regard has been a prominent contribution to thought in the 'communicative turn' in planning theory and practice, particularly urban planning (Rogers, McAuliffe, Piracha, & Schatz, 2017).

Both Habermas and Rawls take two interdependent approaches to public deliberations: (a) the practice of offering reasons to fellow citizens in a public deliberation is a moral imperative and (b) it is essential to ensure public decisions carry legitimacy and therefore ensure compliance, better implementation and stability in the political sphere. The next section discusses evidence to support or discredit (b) in further detail.

## **Cooperation and conflict resolution through public deliberation**

The sustained interest in public deliberation is based on a number of untested assumptions. It is assumed that through increased public deliberation citizens will: become more engaged in civic affairs; have increased tolerance for opposing viewpoints (Barber, 1984; Gutmann & Thompson, 1996); justify their preferences with better arguments; become more aware of interdependencies with others, and less focussed on a 'win-lose' approach, especially in post-conflict societies; become 'empowered', bringing deliberation to their other civic activities and their opinions will become more considered and informed by relevant arguments and evidence (Chambers, 1996).

One of the richest sources of evidence against which to test the above assumptions can be found in psychological studies on small-group decision-making. Mendelberg (2002) explores the literature on the "social dilemma" in which pursuing narrow self-interest, while rational for individuals, is irrational and harmful for the group. Mendelberg's research suggests that facilitating talking between group members can build a genuine willingness to cooperate and can be helpful to convince individuals of the connection between their self-interest and the well-being of the group. Where consensus is achieved in the group discussions, this seems to have a strong positive correlation with actual cooperative behaviour.

However, research on multiple group communication shows that enhancing cooperation among group members may be at the expense of cooperation between groups, especially where the groups are of unequal sizes or power. This may limit the usefulness of public deliberation as a conflict resolution tool in unequal societies. Where groups have competing interests, communication within competing groups is more likely to increase intra-group cooperation at the expense of inter-group cooperation (Bettencourt & Dorr, 1998).

There is also a significant body of work that suggests that public deliberation within a group tends to move the collective opinion in the direction of the pre-existing views of the majority (Schkade, Sunstein, & Kahneman, 2000). It could be that minority opinion holders genuinely change their opinions so as to be part of the mainstream, or they merely say they've changed their minds so as to be part of the mainstream, while maintaining their dissent in private. Either way, this seems to suggest the minority accedes to the power of the majority, rather than is convinced by their arguments. It could be that the majority opinion is genuinely more persuasive as having more members holding that view increases the likelihood of original and convincing arguments being made in its favour (Mendelberg, 2002). However, there is also evidence to suggest that minority opinions can lead majority opinion holders to consider new alternatives and perspectives and to have greater empathy for the minority viewpoint (Schkade et al., 2000).

Research on jury deliberations suggests that the perception of "procedural justice", the perception that the process of decision-making was fair, leads to greater support for the group decision. Thibaut and Walker (1975) argue that participation in deliberation increases consideration of others arguments and so produces fairer outcomes. This relationship appears to hold regardless of whether participants agree with the outcome. In the TRU(e)-Park workshops a number of participants were unhappy with the fairness of the approach from the start, and voiced this dissatisfaction. While the extension of the process went far to

rebuild faith in the process, the legitimacy of its outcome is still limited by the lack of active participation by government decision-makers and low-income groups.

There is considerable evidence to suggest that deliberation can produce more considered, more informed opinions in the group (Gaertner et al. 1999). However there are also studies that contradict this, where participants have made worse decisions in group discussions than they would have done individually. Stasser and Titus (1985) gave participants different bits of information about electoral candidate A, which in aggregate was enough to prove A as the superior candidate. But the group failed to aggregate the information in the group discussion, and support for candidate A actually dropped after group deliberation.

Lastly, the literature also highlights the potential for frustration with deliberation in the absence of real decision-making power. Hibbing and Theiss-Morse (2002) examine a series of experiments which provided opportunities for citizen “voice” under different conditions of procedural fairness, holding the substantive outcome the same but unfair. In cases where there was evidence of the impact of the voice of participants on the eventual decision, this had a positive effect. However, in the absence of real influence, the illusion of voice led to even greater frustration and disenchantment than having no voice at all. For the TRU(e)-Park process this is a real risk as participants raised their frustration at having their “time wasted” if government were not going to record their contributions in full, respond in kind to it and accept these contributions to their decision-making process in a transparent manner.

Therefore, while there is significant support for the potential of deliberation in public decisions, there is also significant evidence that this potential is highly context dependent and laden with opportunities to go awry. Increasing debate can increase consensus, understanding and cooperation where a common position can be found. However increased debate can also lead to increased inter-group friction, the polarisation of opinions and feelings of frustration among participants where a common position cannot be found or influence achieved.

### ***Significance of the literature for TRUP***

In TRUP, participation involves a fairly distinct group of stakeholders bound by a geographical area, with both common and competing views. It is a geographical area where inequality and discrepancies in power are pre-existing among beneficiaries including social exclusion based on income, gender, age, occupation and social capital. The empirical literature outlines how fraught attempting deliberative participation in this context may be, and the outcomes are not necessarily always beneficial.

Some challenges outlined in the literature particularly apply to the TRU(e)-Park process. Affluent participants and civic associations tended to have higher numbers of participants in attendance. This was raised, sometimes indirectly, a number of times during the process. Many participants agreed that the workshops should have been better advertised, and not solely communicated through email or online as low-income groups are less likely to use this form of communication. The workshops were only once held in a lower income neighbourhood, Maitland Garden Village, and transport to the workshops after-hours was an additional barrier for participants without access to a car.

Overall, the implication is that public deliberation could result in a reinforcement of power imbalances within and between groups, especially if socially excluded groups are likely to hold minority opinions. But it may also provide an opportunity for minority opinions to sway the majority, or at least produce greater empathy for and understanding of their perspective.

There is still significant evidence to support the longstanding faith in the potential for participation to develop more cooperative forms of governance. While the literature can

provide guidance for what may or may not work, the only truly conclusive deduction is that deliberative participation is highly context specific and each case is likely to face its own challenges and opportunities. The value of case studies such as TRUP is to explore, in a specific case, the outcomes of public deliberation and their value for the policy-making process.



## Chapter 4: Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method

How citizens communicate what Rawls calls a “comprehensive doctrine” has particular relevance in cities as they are sites for ever-greater proximity between diverse cultures, ideologies and ways of life. Urban planning theory and practice is therefore rapidly adapting to the challenging and ever changing realities of urban life. The challenge for urban policy development is to marry the ideals, which Rawls and Habermas espouse, with the messy and resource-constrained realities policy must respond to. The starting point for this task is to understand how people actually live in cities, how they perceive and understand the urban space they inhabit, how they communicate their ideas and beliefs, and how, in turn, to define the role of policy in response to these realities.

To illustrate this point about the role of urban policy development, take the example of the city of Jakarta. AbdouMalik Simone (Simone, 2014) presents a sweeping picture of Jakarta as a vast city where both policy interventions and neglected spaces in the city simultaneously exhibit an enduring nature and perpetual change. In order to understand the city, its spaces and how urban residents endure within them, Simone argues urbanists need to look at the complexity of urban life rather than simplify it. His research is dedicated not to tying down the nature and movements of Jakarta, but to “keeping it up” by preserving the complex narratives and relationships, often seen only through an urban “hinge” which allows a particular spatial perspective, a snapshot of a particular configuration of material goods, and relationships of the people who inhabit this space at a particular time.

The efficacy of inventive urban policy, Simone argues, is in the “ability to tell a story that attempts to capture the possible articulations among people and places in ways that exceed the usual formats of intelligibility and narrative familiarity” (Simone, 2014). Human beings often make sense of their own complex experiences through stories, which we tell both to others and ourselves. Policies are themselves a particular kind of story. A story about the many stories we as a city, or we as a nation, tell about ourselves. Policy documents, in essence, present a conceptualisation of a problem, situated in a history, involving actors, and an intended solution.

Simone’s research highlights that, “[f]ar from boiling down complex issues to their simplest formulations and then telling citizens what to do in relationship to them, policy work takes all of the different stories being told about why water, power, land, politics, buildings, transport, money, and people act the way they do and draws creative lines of conjunction among them—plausible, attainable, but not necessarily self-evident.” (Simone, 2014).

Studying the language stakeholders use to tell stories, and examining the metaphors, emblematic issues they represent, and turns of phrase, all make up the broader field of discourse analysis. If the aim of this research is to understand how participants in the TRU(e)-Park process understand and experience life in their urban location, and how they communicate their experiences and beliefs through language, then the most effective form of analysis will provide the researcher with tools to understand the use of language in communicating and reproducing power, value, ideology and identity. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) present a preliminary definition of discourse as “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world, or an aspect of it”. They emphasise that “our ways of talking do not neutrally reflect our world, identities and social relations but, rather, play an active role in creating and changing them” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Their work explores three approaches from different disciplines but note that many discourse analysts work across disciplinary borders, and there are many theoretical points and methodological tools that cannot be assigned exclusively to one particular approach. This chapter presents an overview of theory for discourse analysis and specifically focuses on the argumentative turn

in policy analysis, influenced notably by the ideas of Habermas and Foucault, for theoretical constructs and tools for discourse analysis.

## **Discourse and power**

Michel Foucault is one of the fathers of discourse analysis in its application to explore the use of language in power in society. His research focused on broad social settings, spanning years, if not generations, and was ultimately an analysis of power through language. For Foucault, discourses are not only how we understand the world, but also how we create it, and practices that we enact have a discursive element (Parker, 1992). Foucault goes as far as to say that all social practices should be understood by discursive constructions, that discourse actually constructs these practices while also limiting and facilitating the possible understandings of such practice. Under his influence, this idea has become the foundation of many discourse analysis approaches (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Beyond just social practices, Foucault argues that we locate ourselves within the conceptual map, which discourses present. We take on the ideas that a discourse purports, and the roles that go with them, thinking of ourselves in terms of the discourse (Parker, 1992).

Power is central to Foucault's theory of discourse. The role of discourse analysis is to understand how power and knowledge are able to allow or limit certain social practices. Crucially, Foucault rejects a traditional understanding of power as merely the ability to constrain others. Discursive power is power in that it produces reality and shapes our perception of the truth. It is a positive as well as a negative power, it allows us to do some things and limits us in others. Power manifests in dominant discourses, which privilege those versions of social reality that legitimate existing power relations and social structures. Dominant discourses become entrenched in the way people think about everyday things and appear unquestionable even though they are nonetheless contingent and counter-discourses are always possible.

The natural progression of this conceptualisation of discourse is that social practices and social norms solidify into institutional practices, which are similarly bound to discourse. Discourses, and discursive power, therefore, extend to ways of organising, regulating and administering social life (Parker, 1992).

As a qualitative methodology, discourse analysis is used to analyse policies, through the meanings embedded in the language used in policy production and discussion. In this way, both Habermas and Foucault have contributed to a shift in the social sciences away from an empirical approach focused on problem solving and towards approaches focused on language, and its power in argumentation and deliberation (Fischer & Forester, 1993).

## **The Argumentative Turn: a school of thought**

Influenced by the critical theory of both Habermas and Foucault, the argumentative turn is a term used to describe a range of methodologies for policy analysis that emphasise language, meaning, rhetoric and value. The term was first introduced by Frank Fischer and John Forester in 1993. Their compilation of methodologies and analysis sparked a large body of work focused on argumentation. The social sciences in general saw a shift toward deliberation, discourse and social constructivism. In this vein, Fischer and Forester attempted to link "post-positivist epistemology with social and political theory in the search for a relevant methodology" (Fischer & Forester, 1993)

The theories and methodologies which fall under the argumentative turn share a particular focus on communication and argumentation, and "the process of utilizing, mobilizing and

assessing communicative practices in the interpretation and praxis of policy making and analysis” (Fischer & Forester, 1993). They all reject the idea that policy analysis can be an objective, technical, rational project. However they all equally aim to make policy analysis relevant to the needs of policy-makers and the policy-making process, as reflected in the thought and deliberation of politicians, administrations and citizens. The Argumentative Turn includes a number of prominent theorists who argue that “policy making is fundamentally an on-going discursive struggle over the definition and conceptual framings of problems, the public understanding of the issues, the shared meanings that motivate policy responses, and criteria for evaluation” (Fischer & Gottweis, 2012: 9).

Another key feature is that theorists reiterate that language is more than a neutral medium and that it enables or prohibits certain policy problems and solutions. Hermeneutic frame analysis, for example, aims to capture the “systems of meaning that enable particular constructions of policy problems, dynamics of political contestation, intractable policy dilemmas, and acceptable policy solutions” (Hawkesworth, 2012: 254).

The role of the policy analyst in this analysis must be a reflexive one and analysts are themselves subject to particular discourses which shape their understanding of reality and policy problems and solutions. Hajer and Laws (Hajer & Laws, 2006) argue that the role of the policy analyst in discourse analysis is to attempt to adopt a reflexive position outside the cognitive domain of the policy makers, to the extent that one can, in order to understand “how a particular discourse orders the way in which policy actors perceive reality, define reality, define problems, and choose to pursue solutions in a particular direction” (Hajer & Laws, 2006). In this way, they argue, policy analysts can provide practical insights into how policy solutions are developed and how to understand conflict, resolutions and innovation in policy.

### **Argumentative Discourse Analysis and Discourse Coalition Theory:**

Maarten Hajer, following the postpositivist tradition and the Argumentative Turn in policy analysis, regards language as a medium, a system through which actors not simply describe but create the world. Argumentative Discourse Analysis was developed by Hajer and is one of many theories that together make up the Argumentative Turn. It assumes that determining the way a phenomenon is represented in language has implications for political questions such as “Who is to be held responsible? What actions can be taken or should be taken?”

Hajer’s contribution to the argumentative turn has been grounded in analysis of environmental politics through emblematic issues such as acid rain and ‘mad cow disease’ in Europe. Hajer (1995b) argues that, particularly in the field of environmental politics, policy discussions are dominated by key issues that act as emblematic concepts for more fundamental conflicts in the policy discourse. In the case of acid rain he argues that political conflict over government action or inaction transcended a simple conflict of interest, instead it could be understood, using discourse analysis, as two competing and distinct approaches to pollution control which diverge on the appropriate role of science or level of scientific certainty required in the realm of British environmental politics. Hajer’s methodological approach was to examine the definition of political problems and solutions in the context of how they relate to the particular narrative in which they are discussed. The narrative within which problems are discussed can diverge radically, either framing dead trees (in the case of acid rain) as victims, the perpetrators of which should be stopped, or as a natural consequence that cannot definitely be linked to one cause and therefore not requiring significant intervention. In this case, acid rain was an emblematic issue about how Britain responded to its environmental impact and whether it was living up to its local and international responsibilities. Whether specific instances of environmental degradation were

in fact caused by acid rain was secondary to the discussion. In fact, Hajer highlights that some of the examples discussed in the policy debate were later discovered to be the cause of other forms of pollution. However the discourse in which those examples were debated remains relevant regardless, because of the emblematic nature of the issue.

In policy analysis, language has the capacity to shift power-balances and change institutional practise. Discourse analysis, especially that which focuses on stories, metaphors and narratives, is most powerful when done in the socio-historical context of the debate. Hajer (2005b) also emphasises the role that dramaturgical analysis plays in analysing policy-making, as an additional form of communication to language.

Understanding and illuminating discourses allows for a better understanding of controversies, not because it highlights the best or most convincing rational arguments, but rather because it helps understand the rationality of the actors, the argumentation they present and choose to be convinced by. In this sense it is worth noting that discourse involves structures of language and meaning in communications, whether understood by the speaker or their intended audience. It is not always necessary that discourses are obvious to the people who utter them, but it is reasonable to expect that they will be able to recognise them when presented with them (Hajer, 1995a).

A key component of Argumentative Discourse Analysis is the notion of discourse coalitions. It is an approach to politics that argues that different actors form specific coalitions around specific story lines. "Story lines are the medium through which actors try to impose their view of reality on others, suggest certain social positions and practices, and criticize alternative social arrangements" (Hajer, 2005a: 304).

The discourse coalition approach emphasises analysing discourses in their specific socio-historical context and provides the conceptual tools to interpret individual events or debates as situated within their broader political context. The analysis goes beyond one based primarily on individual or group interests, but instead tries to understand how interests and ideas interact with specific discourses and practices. As a theory it aims to understand how actors, groups and/or institutions reproduce or push back against power imbalances without intentionally coordinating their actions or values (Hajer, 2005a: 304).

### ***Defining concepts and tools***

In applying Argumentative Discourse Analysis to the case of the TRU(e)-Park process, with a particular focus on Discourse Coalition Theory, this research relied on a number of core concepts and tools as defined in Hajer's (2005a) research.

**Discourse:** An ensemble of *ideas*, *concepts*, and *categories* through which meaning is given to social and physical phenomena, and which is produced and reproduced through an identifiable set of practices (Hajer, 2005a: 303).

**Metaphor:** Metaphors communicate specific examples as a way to talk about more complicated policy debates. They are ways of talking about the one in terms of the other. For example, in Hajer's discourse analysis of acid rain and environmental policy in Britain, he found that the biological phenomena that actually led to the occurrence of dead trees and fish in the Netherlands was often reduced to 'acid rain'. It didn't necessarily matter in cases where the cause was actually found to be ammonia from nearby pig farms, because the idea of acid rain is representative of larger issues in environmental politics.

**Storyline:** People tend to convey their ideas in story form with a beginning, middle and an end. They tend to include protagonists, a problem statement and a solution. The story is a common and useful way to communicate a complex situation, while casting some characters as villains, some as victims, and presenting a 'moral of the story' or potential solution. Storylines tend to be condensed forms of narrative in which metaphors are used (Hajer, 2005a: 302). Often it is assumed that the listener understands the meaning of the story that the author intends, but this is not always the case, and adds a layer of interpretive complexity to discourse analysis. However, it can also happen that people who do not fully understand one another still together produce meaningful political interventions.

**Discourse coalition:** "A group of actors that, in the context of an identifiable set of practices, shares the usage of a particular set of story lines over a particular period of time" (Hajer, 2005a: 302) In this context 'practice' is "embedded routines and mutually understood rules and norms that provide coherence to social life" (Hajer, 2005a: 302). For example the mutually accepted norms and rules that applied to the SUN Development workshops throughout the year were a set of practices. A discourse coalition is not connected to specific individuals necessarily, but is connected to practices in which actors generally employ storylines and reproduce specific discourses by doing so. A discourse coalition is therefore "an ensemble of story lines, the actors that utter these story lines and the practices through which these story lines are expressed" (Hajer, 2005a: 304). The purpose of discourse coalition analysis is to find ways of relating the analysis of the discursive production of reality with the analysis of the social practices from which social constructs emerge. For the purpose of this research, actors have been linked to their affiliated stakeholder group. This allows the analysis to more clearly outline the positions of different organisations, rather than individuals within that organisation. It also means that occasionally individuals utter story lines that do not neatly fit within the discourse of their group. However overall the data shows individuals had a high degree of alignment with their group's discourse.

As power plays a central role in discourse analysis, Hajer (2005a) provides a set of conceptual tools for linking the analysis of discursive production of meaning to power and influence. For a discourse to have power and influence it will start to dominate the way a society conceptualizes the world. If a discourse is successful many people will use it to conceptualize the world. This can further solidify into an institution, "sometimes as organizational practices, sometimes as traditional ways of reasoning" (Hajer, 2002).

A discourse coalition dominates a given political space if:

"(1) it dominates the discursive space; that is, central actors are persuaded by, or forced to accept, the rhetorical power of a new discourse (known as discourse structuration); and (2) this is reflected in the institutional practices of that political domain; that is, the actual policy process is conducted according to the ideas of a given discourse (known as discourse institutionalization)" (Hajer 2005a: 304)

## **Research Methodology**

Argumentative discourse analysis requires an initial desktop review of literature relevant to a particular policy debate with an overview of the documents and positions in a given field. This could include newspaper analysis, online news blogs or existing policy documents. In the case of TRUP, I conducted a brief overview of online news articles on a number of initial topics and key words that arose from the first stakeholder meeting, namely: affordable housing, density of development, flooding, the role of the private sector and public participation processes. This provided context to each topic and an introduction to dominant discourses in the public domain.

The second step in Hajer's (2005a) research framework has traditionally been 'helicopter' interviews with key actors in the debate or project that can provide a range of different perspectives. SUN Development conducted a number of interviews with individual stakeholders to discuss key concerns for the TRUP area and key stakeholders to be invited to the public participation process. SUN Development shared a brief overview of these for this study.

Whereas other forms of discourse may be text-heavy in their approach, for the purposes of the TRU(e)-Park process it was more relevant to focus on the speech in each workshop as a key source of data. This was partly because the discourse analysis is most useful when analysed across a specific social setting, or set of social practices, such as the workshops. The decision was taken in this academic research to focus almost exclusively on the TRU(e)-Park workshops in order to establish the usefulness of the theory to analyse the outputs of the workshops as the first component in the policy development process. With permission, but without direction, I recorded workshops digitally and transcribed specific workshop recordings word-by-word. After workshops in which there was little debate of key issues, or where the minutes of the workshops captured the proceedings in adequate detail, I used minutes in conjunction with the recordings as the primary source, rather than full transcriptions. The transcriptions extended to a total of 134 pages for approximately eleven hours of selected audio recordings. The complete audio recordings, including those that were not transcribed in full, were approximately 26 hours in length. In both the transcriptions and the minutes, it was usually possible for me to ascribe the name of each speaker to what was said, except for a few exceptions where the speaker's name was unknown. In addition to attending the thirteen official workshops held by SUN Development, TRUPA held monthly civil society coordination meetings to discuss progress on the participation process and draft their response. To gather additional data for the analysis I attended a number of TRUPA meetings with other stakeholders, and reviewed TRUPA meeting minutes and public statements in response to the TRU(e)-Park process. Attending the meetings and workshops in person allowed me direct access to the sites of argumentation and provided an intimate understanding of the argumentative exchanges.

After attending the meetings and completing the transcriptions, the next stage in the research was to analyse meeting minutes, transcriptions and public statements for structuring concepts, ideas and categorisations. Several close readings of the material produced a preliminary list of discourse themes around green open space, heritage, densification and the role of the private sector. For each theme, I extrapolated and summarised the key conflicting stakeholder opinions from the data.

The volume of data, the number of stakeholders and the multiple concepts and tools available in the literature were a challenging combination. In an iterative process, re-examination of the recordings, transcriptions and minutes and re-readings of the literature on argumentative discourse analysis helped to select and develop a list of categories through which to analyse the data. These categories were either based on the concepts and tools provided by the literature on argumentative discourse analysis or were created in response to the content of the data.

Developing a Table which included each category, and each stakeholder group allowed me to revisit the data once again and analyse it in terms of each category in turn. Each category of analysis focused on one particular form of analysis, whether analysing the data in terms of metaphors, stories or key phrases. Having a Table with each stakeholder group outlined allowed for a thorough reading of the data and ensured that the analysis was comprehensive in its application. Once a reading of the data had been completed for each category, I was able to eliminate categories which were no longer useful, or too isolated in

their application. Final categories included key arguments and the counter-arguments employed by stakeholders in response, as well as the employment of story lines and metaphors. Once this categorisation was complete, it was distilled again in a first comprehensive attempt at defining structuring discourses in the discussion.

The literature, in particular the work of Hajer (2005a), emphasises that actors can get 'caught up' in a discussion or argument, particularly in public. They may employ certain discourses for effect in the moment, in reaction to the input from a rival stakeholder. Hajer highlights that stakeholders might force one another to take up particular roles even if they would not hold to that position when pressed on it (Hajer, 2005a). For this reason, understanding where in the timeline of events stakeholders changed their positions or used different language is important so that the analysis can extrapolate as to the cause, and to account for this change within the broader understanding of discursive power across the stakeholder groups. Accordingly, as a crucial part of the research for this academic project, a final reading of the data was conducted to analyse for 'positioning effects': I paid particular attention to differences between what was captured in the minutes and what was captured in the transcriptions, as well as reference to notes taken in-person during the workshops.

After structuring the analysis in tabular form across categories and stakeholders, the detailed data from the table were collapsed into key ideas and concepts which could be structured into discourses. The discourses that were distilled from the analysis focused on the development of Cape Town and cities in general. As part of the analysis, I wrote up each discourse in a narrative form, similar to the format used by stakeholders during the workshops.

The discourses which emerged from the data were all about broader trends and conflicts in urban development. This outcome supports the hypothesis that the development of TRUP was treated as an emblematic issue, evocative of deeper ideological disagreements on the development of Cape Town, and developing cities in general. Once the analysis had identified the key discourses, it further identified which actors uttered storylines from the narratives in each discourse and hence identified discourse coalitions. From the analysis it is clear that a number of discourse coalitions emerged during the workshops, some strengthening over time and some splintering at times.

With a longer time-frame, a research project of this nature would also have referred back to stakeholders to validate the discourse analysis with them. Due to the fact that discourses are by nature inferred by the analyst there is a high degree of interpretation involved, particularly when the data involved the use of stories and metaphors. However one would expect that if the analysis is robust, stakeholders would be able to recognise discourses they employed once presented with them. In this way the analysis can be tested against stakeholder feedback.

In this instance, however, by the time the analysis of the transcription data was complete, several months had passed since the workshops; stakeholders may have shifted positions. Accordingly, secondary interviews with them outside of the timeframe of the original process may not have been a completely reliable reflection of their earlier positions. However, reconnecting with stakeholders is still one of the few ways of validating whether or not the analysis of the discursive space makes sense.

The final analysis, the discourses, the discourse coalitions and the categorical analysis of the data, were compared and contrasted against the final outputs of the TRU(e)-Park process itself. This output, a 240 page report on the process, its inputs and outcomes, was presented during a day-long co-design workshop in February 2017. It was the conclusion of

the year-long process and the beginning of the policy process to revise the local spatial development framework for the TRUP site. The following chapters present the outcomes of the argumentative discourse analysis and compare them with the outcomes of the the TRU(e)-Park process delivered by SUN Development.

Due to the content of the workshops being value laden and directly related to on-going policy development as well as the conflicts between different local organisations during the TRU(e)-Park process, a number of ethical considerations were taken into account while collecting the data. The names of specific participants were always kept confidential, and used only for the purposes of the analysis, except where direct quotes were recorded in the publically available minutes or publically shared slides. Audio recordings and full transcripts were kept securely and confidential.



## Chapter 5: Data Analysis

### Categorical analysis of the data

Analysing the volume of data from meeting minutes and transcriptions, including notes taken while attending the meetings in person, is a daunting task. Given the wide range of methodologies available it was decided to analyse the data through multiple categories, each of which captured different dynamics and increased the rich quality of the output. Each category focuses on a different element of the data or a different question for analysis.

The data were initially organised according to eight categories for the purposes of distilling the discourse across fourteen stakeholder groups. These were later distilled into six after closer analysis of the material. The categories were chosen because they accorded with the literature reviewed, because they emerged independently as important elements of the data for analysis, or both. The full tabulation of the content that was collected and analysed for each category exceeds 13,000 words; including it here pushes the thesis beyond the permissible word-length. The Table is available on request.

### Outcomes of each category-based analysis:

1. Framing: An analysis of the ways in which stakeholders framed their contributions including the implicit assumptions about the purpose of the workshops, the purpose of the stakeholder presentations and the geographic scale at which presentations are pitched.

Multiple stakeholder groups were given the opportunity to present during the workshops and were not given a prescriptive structure to follow. The freedom for each group to present on material of their choice in a medium of their choice meant that there was significant variety in how each presentation was framed. Some stakeholders gave slick presentations on how their vision for TRUP will produce jobs and social development. Some stakeholders chose to present on the history of the land, their personal recollections of growing up in the neighbourhood and the current challenges faced by those living there today. Some presentations focused only on the interventions of their organisation, some presented on their precinct and some presented on the entire TRUP area. Understanding the different framings of each presentation allows one to distinguish between which presentations are comparable and which are not for the purposes of the analysis.

As an example, the presentation from Robin Trust focused exclusively on the history and work of the Robin Trust, and not the overall merit of the Oude Molen Eco Village. The fact that they did not mention arguments in favour of Oude Molen's role in the wider TRUP area does not necessarily mean they are not in favour of such arguments, but rather that their presentation focused on an organisational scale and not a precinct scale. Similarly, some presentations were framed as a discussion on what is currently on the land and some were framed around what could be on the land. OMEV presented on both their proposal for their precinct and for the broader TRUP area, emphasising their selection as a World Design Capital project.

Maitland Garden Village (MGV) did not present a proposal for development but rather emphasised the history of the site and current development challenges faced by the community. They located their presentation within the history of forced removals and neglect of poor urban areas in Cape Town. Similar to Robin Trust, Valkenberg, SKA, BIOVAC and the River Club all kept their presentations focused on their individual development projects, with some reference to wider co-benefits of the development. As to

be expected, both WCG and CoCT focused on the bigger picture, but WCG presented an aspirational vision and CoCT presented on the current policy frameworks which govern the TRUP site. The First Nation and the Western Cape Council of Nguni People (WCCNP) framed their contributions as a summary of the history of the land, and the role of traditional authorities over its future development.

2. Legitimacy: An analysis of the different ways stakeholders framed the legitimacy of the process including the assumptions or arguments given for the legitimate role of different groups in the process

Stakeholders engaged both with the process, its merits and challenges, as well as with the substantive content of the discussions within the process. This category focuses on discourse specific to the nature of the process, its legitimacy and the legitimate role of different actors. This approach was not necessarily highlighted in the literature on argumentative discourse analysis but was highlighted strongly in the literature on public deliberation outcomes. This was corroborated by the stakeholders themselves who raised points relating to the fairness or efficacy of the process a number of times during the workshops.

There were several disagreements, through the workshops, on what the appropriate role of government, the professional team, the TRUP Association and traditional leaders ought to be and how information on the process and its content ought to be communicated and to whom.

OMEV argued that the professional team should not be seen as having an equal say in the process, that their opinions are not as legitimate as the stakeholders and City and Province. OMEV also emphasised that governments are the custodians of the land not the owners. And as such they are there to do the bidding of the people and not to make unilateral decisions.

A number of participants argued that the process ought to include everyone in the city and more effort should be made to include participants who do not currently reside in the area by using advertisements in the press or even holding a city-wide referendum.

MGV framed government as being responsible for service provision and development of the area. Residents again highlighted a feeling of being forgotten about in the process. In response to a presentation from WCG in Workshop 5a, which urged that we should “listen to the river” to guide development in the site, an attendee from MGV, Cecilia Fouchee, responded, “You say listen to the river, but no one is listening to us”. This perceived tension between prioritising the needs of people versus prioritising the needs of the environment persisted throughout the workshops.

TRUP Association presented itself as the legitimate spokesperson of civil society organisations involved in the TRUP area. A number of its contributions implied that governments are not to be trusted to follow a fair and transparent process, but neither are SUN Development or private business. TRUPA, and others, argued the stakeholder engagement process should not be rushed just to make the arbitrary four-workshop deadline set in the original terms of reference. Private development was a contentious point for a number of stakeholders, and many felt it should be something that is constrained. A number of the civic associations argued that private developers should not be allowed to move ahead in the TRUP site until the outcomes of the public participation process had been solidified in policy for the area, highlighting this as a key risk to the legitimacy of the process. Both OMEV and the River Club presented themselves as the official “gateway” to

the park, which was a key tension over the ownership of the area and highlighted a common assumption by both groups that there would be any “gateways” at all.

TRUPA felt it was unacceptable that the River Club land was sold with so little public input. And a general sentiment from TRUPA, OMEV and others was that public land should not be sold off to private developers. OMEV directly criticised the City for having sold off so much of its public land already. Stakeholders across different groups all felt that stakeholders know more about history and culture in the area and they should be the ones to provide information on this and other localised knowledge.

3. Values: The most important and valuable things aspects about the land for stakeholders, whether in relation to how the presentation is famed or whether in relation to the whole of TRUP or the piece to which the presentation refers

Because stakeholders did not necessarily frame their presentation in a comparable manner, the analysis focused on higher order values behind why stakeholders chose to present the material they did. In other words if the material emphasised history and disenfranchisement in the area then the values behind this are inclusivity, justice, equal opportunity and memorialising the past. This was a useful exercise to extrapolate insights from the data across the different contributions and better understand each group’s deeply held values and beliefs.

OMEV prioritised the importance of job creation and ground-up social entrepreneurship, as well as protecting the environment and honouring the heritage in the area as the most important aspects of the site. Stakeholders from OMEV who attended also raised the importance of their horses, and the aesthetic of the village and surrounding area as important. A number of stakeholder groups emphasised common values, but presented very different interventions to achieve them. In general, the analysis highlights that values such as to ‘protect the environment’ or ‘honour heritage’ can mean something different from one stakeholder group to the next. Values are something that many stakeholders had in common, and yet the narratives around those values were strikingly different. Emphasising values in the process was often seen as a way to bring diverse perspective together to something they have in common, and yet this can also make it difficult to clearly understand the differences.

For MGCV, “[T]he biggest need is housing...Houses and houses and houses. ” said Cecilia Fouchee in Workshop 8a. Her presentation also emphasises their central location and connection to the rest of the city, the community and the history of the neighbourhood. Safety is a paramount concern, particularly in raising children in the area. Participants highlighted drugs, alcohol abuse, teen pregnancies and road accidents as key concerns.

For Valkenberg, the ability to safely care for patients in a therapeutic, healing environment that supported mental health and did not compromise the security of the forensic unit was paramount. A number of groups (Friends of the Liesbeek, SAAO, TRUPA) argued that the river crucially performs an environmental function and connects the peninsula to the rest of the city.

The most important thing, therefore is balancing the social, economic and environmental needs when considering development in the surrounding areas while protecting the vulnerable and endangered fauna and flora in the area.

For TRUPA, preserving the open space was important, but so was acknowledging the role of the people and associations who have made TRUP what it is today. This means not

splitting up the OMEV site, and taking the ideas and proposals for ground-up development seriously. Important characteristics of the site were its openness for pedestrian traffic, its biodiversity, the lifestyle it supports, and its central role in connecting green spaces and ecosystem services.

BIOVAC, OMEV, SKA and the River Club all emphasised their ability to provide jobs as very important, if not most important, while MGV foregrounded the need for employment and the negative effects on the community of unemployment. However BIOVAC emphasised the importance of preventing a brain drain of scientists specifically, and the risk of South Africa losing its top scientists without facilities like the Cape Health Technology Park. BIOVAC also presented its ability to contribute to innovation and learning in biotechnology on the African continent, while OMEV argued it could provide learning for social entrepreneurship. SKA also emphasised the need to support the sciences, and the advancements that could be made with their development, but framed this as being a matter of international pride and recognition, that South Africa has the opportunity to be a world leader with the SKA project.

WCCNP focused on the opportunity the development of TRUP has to build something that represents the history of the land and keeps alive the traditional way of life. For the First Nation, most important is the site's historical significance to the Khoisan people and its representation as an example of the wider struggles of the Khoi and San peoples for land reclamation and genuine civic participation and recognition in politics.

For the CoCT and WCG, it's difficult to say which aspect of development of the site is most important, as both presented a vast range of objectives without necessarily prioritising one in particular. Instead, they emphasised that the development must meet a large number of objectives, including most of those raised by stakeholders themselves. However they did emphasise that any new development must align with existing planning and policy documents currently governing the city.

#### 4. Repetition: Repeated phrases, themes or key words

Taking note of key phrases or themes that emerge out of stakeholder presentations or are repeated during stakeholder interactions was a useful tool to gather snapshots of the content in each presentation, its lasting impression, and the possible other discourses that it referenced. This was particularly useful where presenters referred to other processes or examples, such as the World Design Capital or the development of Kirstenbosch, and other concepts, such as Live-Work-Play or Transport Oriented Development.

**Table 1: Summary of repeated phrases, themes and key words used by stakeholder groups in the TRU(e)-Park process**

Stakeholder Group	Repeated phrases, themes or key words
OMEV	Custodianship/ World Design Capital/ Social Entrepreneurship/ Kirstenbosch/ Central Park/ Tourism/ Unique/ Imagine
MGV	Safety/ community/ jobs/ affordable housing/ safe transport/ access/ voice/ camaraderie in the community

Valkenberg Hospital Revitalisation Project	Light/ healing/ de-institutionalising the building/ security/ surveillance
Robin Trust	Care/ healing/ faith/ healing environment/ self-funded organisation/ job creation/ Green-Live-Work-Play environment
The River Club	Sterile open space/ man-made/paradigm-shift/ opportunity
TRUPA	No-go areas/ social entrepreneurship/ Kirstenbosch/ preserving the natural environment/ green lung / biodiversity/ health of the river
BIOVAC	Innovation/ job creation
SKA	Innovation/ recognition
WCCNP	Truth and lies/ facts in the history of South Africa/ integration/ tradition
The First Nation	History/ blood lineage and traditional authority/ lack of recognition/ an unlegislated people/ democracy did not change things for the First Nation/ land dispossession/ United Nations/ Harry the Strandloper/ Kroatoa/
SUN Development and team of experts	Game changer/ Live-Work-Play/ connected green open space
WCG	Live-Work-Play/ treasure the treasures/ listen to the river/ let's make that out legacy/ this is my dream/ celebrate the space/ beautiful and precious places/ memories/ this is a special place

#### 5. Argumentation: The key arguments referred to for the development of TRUP and the rebuttals or responses they elicited

This category captured any speech or text that was designed to persuade other attendees, predominantly in the form of an argument that made use of premises and a conclusion. Some of the speech or text included incomplete arguments. Sometimes were statements without further substantiation explicitly stated or a premise with an implied conclusion that was unspoken. Some of the arguments were not in an explicitly logical form but instead included references to an argument that seemed self-evident to the speaker. Some presented a conclusion that did not follow from premises given. The logical strength of the argument was not necessarily important for the research analysis. Rather the analysis recorded responses from participants (whether positive or negative) to the arguments presented and looked at whether the arguments were taken up by other stakeholders. A brief summary of the relevant arguments per stakeholder group follows:

OMEV: Key arguments put forward by OMEV were around the role of government as custodians, recognition of the ground up nature of the work to date in OMEV and the benefits of the social enterprise management model. They referenced Richard Branson and the World Design Capital to add weight to their claims, and compared TRUP to a future Kirstenbosch. Criticism was levelled at the City for selling off its properties and entering into public-private partnerships that benefit the private sector at the expense of public interests.

They argued current green areas must be preserved as is, with no development in them at all.

MGV: Key arguments focused on the decline of pedestrian accessibility, safety and a lack of consideration for MGV. MGV argued that they are essentially an “island” between the developments under consideration. They argued that developments like BIOVAC and others seem to hold no direct benefit for MGV.

Valkenberg: Valkenberg argued that its current revitalisation development has to make a trade-off between being pedestrian-friendly and being a very secure and a safe location for patients. The hospital is a high-security facility by nature. Participants questioned whether Valkenberg should be in the centre of the city if it is going to require security, implying it would be better placed on the outskirts of the city.

In response, Katherine Bleazard from Valkenberg posed a counter question: why should the mentally ill be banished to the outskirts of the city, do they not also have the right to enjoy the central location of the hospital? This is especially pertinent, she argued, when the mentally ill have often been kept out of public eye so as not to inconvenience others. Valkenberg has been in its current location since 1891, and a number of participants raised their support for the idea that they are just as entitled to remain there as anyone else. Participants argued the site has intrinsic historical value and should not be moved. And in addition, that it has links to UCT and other learning institutions and therefore is not disconnected from other activities in the centre of the city. However, TRUPA reiterated their argument that it is not fair for Valkenberg to have exclusive use of the bridge and the entire area in its precinct and that the fences should be around the buildings, not the perimeter.

The TRUP Association (including Friends of the Liesbeek, SAAO and others): The Association argued that the health of the city can be seen in the rivers of the city. Therefore, they presented as evidence that society is failing the environment the litter, pollution, plastics and poor urban drainage of local rivers. Disconnected green spaces, they argued, cannot thrive without resources and attention to connect and protect them. Organisations like Friends of the Liesbeek are already making great progress cleaning up the river, and TRUPA reiterated that stakeholders should support these efforts.

TRUPA contend that the private sector is only driven by profit, and the city's finances are too reliant on the private sector, rates and taxes. Instead, the city needs alternative financial models to make social entrepreneurship work. They argue brownfield sites like Ndabeni should be where development happens, not within the green space. TRUP should not have to accommodate all of the city's need in one site. There are other opportunities for development.

Having people living together harmoniously is what heals the city, and that is what we need, argued TRUPA. While TRUPA claim that the priority of the city and the province is focused on the idea of releasing land and, TRUPA maintained that they have a broader vision which they're looking at, namely, how the whole area is going to go forward, in order to unite the city, protect green spaces and allow the park and the city to interconnect. They argued against giving the rights to developers to intrude and spoil the potential of the park just because government 'wanted to get moving'. The status quo needs to be protected, they insisted.

Robin Trust: The organisation outlined how their work aligns with international development objectives, such as the old millennium development goals and the new Sustainable Development Goals, in that it reduces extreme poverty and hunger. The work of Robin

Trust, they argue, advances the objectives of the country and the international community. Being located in OMEV allows the organisation to do this, they claim. OMEV and the people who run it help to fix beds when they break and they carers claim the animals have a therapeutic effect. They argue the patients love the environment.

The River Club: The River Club outlined how Transnet previously used the green open space around the River Club for dumping, and that if one drills into it today there is rubble and glass and plastic. They argue that from a geotechnical point of view the land is sterile, that even the river is man-made and polluted. The area, they claim, is not really a natural system anymore and therefore not an 'environment' to protect. If part of the ground level were raised for development, they say their modelling shows it would not affect flooding in the area. This information is a paradigm shift for how they think about the River Club development and potentially opens up greater possibilities.

There are many significant heritage features on the site, they conceded. However they maintain that doesn't mean no development but merely that we need to celebrate, market and own those features. The private developer claims to recognise that TRUP is not just an empty park but a mixed use space of green areas and buildings including interconnections with the river, housing, research facilities, conservation efforts and office space. The River Club aims to provide a destination that will attract people here, and showcase what is happening elsewhere within TRUP. The CoCT expressed agreement with a number of points in the proposal, and argued the River Club could be an ideal "gateway" to the TRUP site. They further stated that the River Club development was a good example of how to implement the principles behind the manifesto for TRUP.

OMEV responded to the River Club by arguing that there is limited capacity for development that the environment can sustain, and proposals like the River Club's will limit the number of people from areas like Nyanga and Khayelitsha who are able to move to TRUP because it will already be overpopulated. OMEV argued that we should reserve the limited capacity of the area for developments that will benefit those most deserving. The River Club responded by arguing that you can't place hard limits on how many people are allowed to live in a particular neighbourhood, it is almost impossible to turn people away. The River Club argued that we must find ways to harness demand for land and protect the environment against some of the negative effects of inevitable growth and expansion of cities and neighbourhoods, but that we will have to be more selective in what we protect.

TRUPA responded to the River Club's presentation by arguing that we should not be looking to big business to have altruistic motives, and therefore they are not good protectors of what is precious in cities. We should not, they claim, be leaving it up to them to develop our vulnerable places, rivers or people. Profitable developments must be second to protecting the green lung of the city. Development will destroy the beautiful green space unless it is limited and constrained, reiterated TRUPA.

The River Club responded to the argument from TRUPA by saying that municipalities and provincial governments don't build cities; at best they set the framework. However ultimately what builds a city, builds the buildings and investment, is big business, argued the River Club. And the challenge for stakeholders is to nurture that energy and profit motive. An example the River Club gave was of Century City, which they argue has been successful because it attracts the value from the birds and the wetlands. That wetland system would die without the development around it and its vested self-interest for the developer to look after that environment because of its value. This is the synergy they argue we need.

BIOVAC: BIOVAC begin their presentation by highlighting that Cape Town is lucky to have two academic hospitals and great universities while housing about 64% of the country's medical device innovation. The proposal from BIOVAC strives to capitalise on this advantage. They propose the development of a medicinal herb garden so that when the public walk through the area they can see what buchu looks like. They could have a 'Science at Work' exhibition, where highschoolers could see for themselves the role of science in medicine and get a better idea if that's what they want to do. BIOVA argue that this fits with the philosophy behind TRUP having access for the public to learn and interact with it.

BIOVAC claim they can support government to meet its targets of producing more doctorates and creating employment for scientists to keep them in Cape Town, making it a hub for biotechnology. They highlight that there is a huge appetite for overseas funders to fund research and facilities in South Africa, particularly as a springboard for them and that it would be a great opportunity to put money back into start-ups and job creation

TRUPA responded to BIOVAC to argue that in 10 years time, TRUP will be the centre of the city and the only green space left. We should not, they argue, be putting factories in the middle of the city, neither should the city sell properties in the centre of the city or allow factories like BIOVAC with potential biohazards in the green space. The CoCT disagreed with this claim, and instead offered support for the BIOVAC proposal, arguing it was the kind of higher order use the site can accommodate, making good use of its accessibility and location. However, CoCT did note that it would be better to incorporate a greater residential component.

OMEV argued that BIOVAC would bring massive high walls, high security and industrial style development that would cut off MGV from surrounding areas and be counter to the ethos of the area being an open green space. It would bring high tech scientists with cars, and those people won't be likely to use the non-motorised transport that the area could develop. BIOVAC responded to say it wouldn't be a hard barrier, like the current development, but include more flow for people. And that scientists can use bicycles and other forms of transport. OMEV argued that the only reason BIOVAC was even considering expanding into OMEV was because it happened to be the land closest to its current site, but perhaps its current site is poorly located. And in 10-20 years BIOVAC will want to expand again, potentially destroying OMEV, its horse paddocks and the harmony it has created. BIOVAC would be better located in industrial areas like Epping.

SKA: SKA themselves put forward very few explicit arguments in favour of their development, instead using the time to explain the process to date and the developments that may follow. They did however argue that they would benefit from being centrally located in TRUP and that the project as a whole would contribute to understanding the universe, potentially bringing prestige for South African researchers. The development of the SKA building, they argued, needed to reflect the prestige and importance of the award, be iconic and support environmental sustainability and high-end technology. The new River Club development, the SKA argued, has the potential to provide high-end facilities like a gym, restaurants and accommodation.

TRUPA argued the development of the SKA could have a lower footprint on the green space if it was co-located with the SAAO instead, and provide co-benefits to both institutions. TRUPA further argued that the choice of site must consider how SKA will expand in the future. Their building impact in the green space should be limited, according to TRUPA, by splitting the proposed site and locating it where the SAAO is. The CoCT argued that the proposal should emphasise co-benefits, especially with educational



institutions in the area. Stakeholders were also interested in, for example, being able to benefit from the facility's new internet connectivity infrastructure.

**WCCNP:** The Western Cape Council of Nguni People stated that the TRUP site is critical to the Nguni people in terms of cultural and historical importance. History should not be deliberately distorted as it has in the past, they argued. They state that historical facts are known, the question is how will they be accommodated. For the WCCNP, the new South Africa is not all new. Black people are still living in poverty and now struggle against the democratic state. The WCCNP proposal is that history is commemorated with a traditional village and a museum and/or monument. While the WCCNP says it notes that land is not in abundance, its proposal is for something symbolic. Tourists who visit South Africa won't be going to far away places where there is still a traditional way of life, and this way they will also learn about the traditions of our people and our heritage, the WCCNP argues. Now is the time for reconciliation and integration, where we are all individuals and see each other as that. WCCNP also acknowledged the people who have been living in the TRUP site for generations and highlighted that it was aware of the importance of the site's more recent history too. Now, the WCCNP emphasised, is also the time to act, not just to talk of reconciliation and integration.

The WCCNP warns that densification can bring social ills, but that it depends on the form it takes. The challenges faced by densely located backyard dwellers are different to those in four storey apartment blocks. However the WCCNP highlights that dense development can also have a cultural impact, especially if people no longer have their own house or space for cultural activities like rituals in one's homestead. The WCCNP argues that while it understands that we must move forward with the cultural way of life, it is concerned about over-crowding with densification, particularly of poor people who are living in dense areas. However, the WCCNP also stated that if densification is embraced by the majority of people and by the government and convincing arguments for it are presented, then the council will support it.

The First Nation: The presentation by the First Nation made several arguments. It stated that the Khoi and San peoples are the oldest nation, and that the King of the First Nation is able to trace his lineage back to 1652, to a royal family. Many South Africans, of different races, are descendants of the Khoisan. This, the First Nation states, gives the King modern day authority over the land, authority to speak on behalf of many South Africans and confirms that he has the last say on the developments in TRUP. The First Nation made clear that the King had only been informed about the process towards its end, at short notice. He therefore strongly objected to any development on the land and reiterated that any future development must seek his approval first.

OMEV responded to say they also see the King as the King of all South Africa, and they are interested in what he has to say. The TRUPA asked how having a King can fit with the constitution of South Africa. The King responded to say that it is not his role to sit in government or politics; it is the role of the King to lead by example and to teach others of their history. However the current struggle of the First Nation is for recognition first, to be legislated as the original people of South Africa.

WCCNP responded that if the First Nation is rejecting the development, it doesn't mean it will not happen. The best way, the council argued, is to be a part of the development and claim one's rightful position as a stakeholder. Nothing is gained by rejecting it, the council claims. The King responded that the representative from WCCNP is Xhaleka, and therefore has no authority or right to criticise the King. An attendee from OMEV jumped in at this point to ask what this would mean for the horses at OMEV. OMEV also responded that there

seems to be a tension between being the King and having absolute authority being a custodian of the land for the people. The King responded to argue that it is his responsibility to protect the land, and its value, for the people as well as from the people. To be a custodian, says the King, is to protect the land from being abused. Without knowing what development's are planned for the TRUP are or trust in the policy or engagement process, the King therefore must protect the land by opposing any development on it without his involvement.

SUN Development: The professional team, including SUN Development presented a number of arguments in relation to the development on TRUP. They presented the well-known context of South Africa's housing solutions, which have typically been the 40m<sup>2</sup> home, 14km away, where people spend 40% of their income on transport in a community that's 40% unemployed. TRUP, they argue, is an opportunity to implement an alternative model. TRUP sits in the inclusionary social housing environment, with potential for development in and around the site. SUN Development highlight that cities around the world are realising that value creation is what is important. That compact cities harness the movement economy connecting social initiatives and economic benefits. Biodiversity areas, like TRUP, are highly fragmented, which is a missed opportunity, they state. However they also argue that a conflict is playing out on the TRUP site. On one side of the conflict is the landscape and on the other side is the infrastructure that has been built and has taken advantage of the open space that was preserved by the floodplain. We must, they argue, bring together these two components that are equally needed in a more balanced way. They present a vision of the future in which TRUP could be an amazing ecological corridor from Table Mountain to the ocean and the starting point for major change in the city.

CoCT: The CoCT felt that both the SKA and CHTP (BIOVAC) were institutions that would need to be accommodated on or within the TRUP area. They anticipate they will contribute to the economic development of the technology sector and to the social development of the area. However the CoCT argued that they must contribute directly to the area, allow pedestrian access, conform to a larger vision for the area and contribute to a positive environment. They reiterated that the City's Urban Design Policy 2013 should be applied to each precinct, as well as many other policies.

The CoCT said it is aware that some stakeholders would like to see a lot of development while others would prefer very little development in the area. The CoCT argued that the question of how much development was one that needed to be thrashed out in the public participation process. It highlighted that there are different landholders with different development objectives for the area but that the site is also a public amenity of metropolitan significance. It must therefore be looked after and nurtured. The CoCT argued that a park is not a frilly little park with roses that one might find in a UK town. An urban park, in the context of Cape Town, has got a broader vision of what it must accommodate inside that spatial context. The CoCT emphasised that the historical and cultural legacy of what has happened on the TRUP site ought to be treasured and reflected.

WCG: The WCG noted that there have been several requests for space in TRUP made during the stakeholder engagement process. Some opportunities are more urgent than others and, the WCG argued, cannot wait for the conclusion of the new policy development. WCG believe the river needs change and that leaving it as is, is not an option. Its development, however, must allow for a space for people and attempt to accommodate everyone's wishes. Yet the development has to be dense, mixed and in some places high-rise, claim the WCG. The provincial government feel that there are very few sites in the world like this, and it is not Central Park, the Table Mountain National Park or the Waterfront but a unique space. However it has been destroyed and underdeveloped by pollution,

mismanagement, unplanned development, uncontrolled construction, illegal occupation, flooding, crime, barricades and fences, and the sterilization brought about by institutional and industrial buildings. The WCG maintain that the idea behind OMEV and its activities should be protected and built on as a business opportunity and tourist destination. MGCV should become an example of sustainable development and green buildings. Most importantly, state WCG, the TRUP site is a special one and stakeholders should therefore not fight with one another about it, rather, they should fight together for it.

#### 6. Stories: The central stories and/or metaphors that are used to talk about the land

This category distilled stories from the text and speech, where these involved protagonists and plots or storylines with a beginning and end. Metaphors included any instance in which the presentation, speech or text used imagery to discuss the topic at hand that was not an accurate portrayal of the state of affairs described and yet still conveyed an important dimension to the discussion. As with the category on argumentation, reproducing the stories and metaphors in full is too detailed for this section. Stripped down for digestibility, the content and nature of the stories and metaphors distils as follows from the contributions across participant groups:

OMEV: Presenters and participants frequently referred to the story of how OMEV was built, and the journey it has been through to the present day. It is a story about ground-up development and the success of dedicated individuals who used derelict buildings and unused land from government and turned it into something that encapsulates what life in the city should look like. It is aspirational, but not without challenges faced by the protagonists who struggle to keep OMEV funded and running as well as it could without support from government. It is a forward looking story that details what OMEV could become, how many people it could support in the social entrepreneurship model and how it can give back to society if it was adequately financed and allowed to continue on the current site in full. It exemplifies how profits could be redistributed back into the community rather than into developers, to shareholders, for Lamborghinis or holiday houses. It often references other examples as comparable to TRUP, like Kirstenbosch and Central Park, both of which are notably prestigious and cost-intensive examples. However their intention is to show the power of parks to attract international recognition and tourism.

MGV: MGV presenters recounted a number of stories centred on growing up in MGV, and being near to the river and the mountain. The stories are historical, although MGV does also provide a few shorter contributions on what life is like in MGV today and the struggles faced by the community. MGV talk of being one of the oldest communities in Cape Town, and that their story began with forced removals and still they live under insecure conditions with a growing number of backyard dwellers, lack of employment and safety concerns. The community directly links the consequences of its socio-economic circumstances to substance abuse and teenage pregnancies. Cecilia Fouchee, from MGV, recounts her experience growing up in MGV as catching tadpoles in the river, experiencing the flooding of the river and remembering the views of the mountain. The stories, both past and present, have overarching themes. One is of distrust for government based on past actions in bad faith. The second is of the resilience of the community, its ability to work together, providing social facilities that government had not, and how important those facilities are for the community to feel like a community.

Robin Trust: The story of Robin Trust is the story of Leslie McLeod-Downes, the founder of the organisation and a single mother from Pinelands. Her daughter, Robin, became ill with a degenerative neurological condition, prompting Leslie to start Robin Trust. The organisation was also started as a product of Leslie's faith. From there, it has grown to provide training

for so many nurses and caregivers and provide a safe, healing environment for patients. The story centres around Leslie's faith, determination and compassion. Similar to OMEV it is a story about using abandoned government buildings and making something unique and miraculous from it that benefits the country at large. The story emphasises the role of individuals, as well as the team of carers and organisers who now run Robin Trust and the warmth and caring they bring to it despite its humble resources. It is a story about triumphing against the odds and providing for the most vulnerable - both the patients and the carers who undergo training and work experience in an economic climate where decent work is scarce.

The River Club: The River Club presentation does not make much use of stories or metaphors, except one added from the personal perspective of Geoff Underwood, the presenter on behalf of the River Club. Geoff describes how he too had misgivings about the TRUP area development, but that he was poorly informed. He thought TRUP was just an open space that got flooded, and that no more could be done with it. The story is one of him becoming acquainted with the new conclusions of the modelling the River Club commissioned of flooding in the area. It shows that you could develop within the flood plain, and for Geoff he now sees this as a great opportunity. He also says that finding out that much of the land around the River Club is sterile is what really convinced him. He describes his life as a resident of Pinelands, and of walking with his grandson. The open area is too unsafe for him to use it, but with the development from the River Club he feels it could be transformed into a place safe for everyone to enjoy.

WCCNP: The stories presented are about important historical authority figures who lived in and around the TRUP site, as well as important historical events that took place there. The stories are not recounted in full in the workshops, but are known in the public domain. These included the life of King Langalibalele, King of the amaHlubi, who resided in Pinelands after his release from Robben Island, in 1875. He is portrayed as both a victim and a hero in history. The battle of the Isandlwana, and the battle of Ulundi, which are collectively known as the Anglo-Zulu War, are also linked to the area by the fact that King Cetshwayo was exiled to the Cape and become an inhabitant of Pinelands, from 1879 up to 1883. The establishment of the Ndabeni area just before 1901 is told as a story of black migrant workers who were forcibly removed to Langa. Collectively, these are stories about people and events that are a part of the nation building and cultural identity of the Nguni people and the Zulu people in particular. They are stories about dispossession, injustice suffered by the Nguni people at the hands of colonists and Apartheid regime but also of the personal lives and triumphs of historic individuals.

The First Nation: The central story that encapsulates the relationship between the First Nation and the TRUP area is the story of Goringhaicona Chief Autshumao (also known as Harry the Strandloper) and his niece, Krotoa. As historical figures, they are of great importance to the Khoisan people. The stories about their lives, as much as is currently known of them, are stories about the injustice and treachery of the Dutch East India Company and the tragic dispossession suffered by the Khoisan. Krotoa's story is particularly poignant as she was a woman who had to navigate the difficult divide between working for the colonists and being caught between two important Khoisan lineages. As a story it is one about the complexity of internal social structures in the Khoisan and the struggle to survive in difficult circumstances while maintaining a degree of autonomy and self-determination. However it is also a story about a young woman who demonstrated a huge amount of tenacity and strength in order to live between different worlds. The story of Krotoa is one that holds great significance for the Khoisan people, and increasingly for all South Africans as the country aims to adequately commemorate the great women in its history.

Krotoa passed through the Liesbeek river at the time that she was becoming a woman, and this holds symbolic significance for the area as the place where Krotoa went from a child to a woman, and where her mother's home was. Similar to the stories told by WCCNP, the stories told by the First Nation clearly emphasise that multiple changes in power in the country have not resulted in emancipation for all. Instead, it is a story of how land was first taken by the colonists, then Apartheid and then democracy. And a story of how a people cannot be separated from the land that ties them to their history and identity.

WCG: The WCG includes one of the most significant metaphors in the process. Francois Joubert, Director of the Cape Town Central City Regeneration Program at the WCG who spoke on behalf of the WCG, quoted Herman Hesse in his presentation saying, 'the river has taught me to listen'. In this metaphor, Francois illustrates that the stakeholders and professional team are charged with responding to the ecological need of the river and being inspired by its natural features. However he clarifies that it is not only a case of listening to the river, it is a case of having a conversation with the river. And in this conversation it will be the stakeholders listening to the river, and occasionally the river will have to listen to the stakeholders. At the moment, the river is saying that development has taken away its ability to deal with floods and to protect people against those floods.

The metaphor is powerful in that it foregrounds the need to respect nature and respond to its needs in order to be healthy. However it is also a metaphor for pushing back against the natural systems in the area, and realising that aspects of them will have to be sacrificed to fit the needs of people who have a competing interest in the area for development. The metaphor continues with the use by MGTV, who say that people are listening to the river and not to the residents of MGTV. In that case, the desire to protect the natural environment is at the expense of the need to protect and include vulnerable people in the area.

### **Comparing and contrasting the argumentative discourse analysis approach to the TRU(e)-Park process**

Comparing and contrasting argumentative discourse analysis, and the use of the categories chosen, to the final outputs of the TRU(e)-Park process, allows the research to make claims as to the usefulness of argumentative discourse analysis. In order to do this, the comparison made use of the Co-design Workshop Resource Sketchbook (2017) presented by SUN Development as a summary of the proceedings at the final workshop. This included the manifesto and the final version of the preferred scenarios.

The manifesto, developed by the TRU(e)-Park process, was drafted in the first and second workshops early in 2016. It consists of ten fundamental principles that were identified in the first workshops. The manifesto is intended to guide any future decision-making process regarding the TRUP site and its precincts, and development proposals ought to conform to the ten principles. This includes future public participation processes, policy decision-making, management systems, urban design, water engineering and landscape design principles for the area. It was used by the SUN Development team as a fundamental tool in the co-design process.

The principles do capture some of the core themes that emerged in the argumentative discourse analysis. It includes an emphasis on safety and the limiting of development in the green space, which was raised by stakeholders. But it does not address the tension between stakeholders who wanted no development in greenfield sites and the stakeholders who argued that some greenfield sites were not worth protecting. Neither party's position is captured by the vague sentiment to "limit" development and preserve ecological integrity. The critical disagreement between stakeholder groups is about how much and where to limit

development. Similarly, the manifesto advocates a dense, mixed-tenure urban environment. Nobody in the workshops was completely against density of any kind. But how dense and where was a heated topic for almost all stakeholders. Including the phrase “where appropriate” in the principle does little to guide decision-makers as to what densities are appropriate where.

In general, this criticism applies to almost all of the ten principles. The manifesto does little to resolve or navigate any of the conflicts that emerged during the thirteen workshops. Instead it glosses over them, frustrating stakeholders who have spent hours on detailed contributions to a lengthy process and cannot see their contribution reflected in the Manifesto. This is not particularly surprising, since the Manifesto was drafted at the very beginning of the process and was never updated, partly because it is so generalised that nothing stakeholders contributed subsequently was outside of its broad sweeping statements. It therefore neglects the key details of stakeholder contributions.

If government decision-makers or private developers were to be presented with the manifesto as the key outcome of the discussions in those workshops, it would do a poor job of producing future developments that stakeholders would endorse. Stakeholders would be unlikely to feel that they had a hand in shaping future developments through the manifesto. This is for two reasons: (1) the principles are too generalised and do not address the specific disagreements raised by stakeholders, instead choosing to present a watered-down version which all stakeholders could agree to on some level; and (2) it leaves out the contributions from the First Nation, OMEV and MGVS around a lack of transparency from government over generations, a crucial disagreement about the authority of government to proceed with development in the site at present and the important role of ground-up development going forward.

For example, the River Club development is proposed by the private developer on a greenfield site surrounding the existing River Club. When this proposal is evaluated against the manifesto it appears to align with all the principles the manifesto espouses. And yet many stakeholders, specifically OMEV and the TRUP Association, feel strongly that the River Club development violates the integrity of the ecological system and will eat into valuable green open space while benefitting big business at the expense of ground-up development. The manifesto alone cannot explain this disagreement nor guide decision-makers on how to respond to it. Similarly, the expansion of BIOVAC into the OMEV site is in accordance with the principles of the manifesto, and yet there have been so many objections from stakeholders about this development.

Another key output of the TRU(e)-Park process is the development of the preferred scenario for the TRUP area. The preferred scenario is a spatial vision for development in the area, selected by participants. Two potential scenarios were developed by the professional team and a third was developed by a group of stakeholders led by the TRUPA. The scenarios provided some specific recommendations for development in the precincts and surrounds. All three scenarios were presented at Workshop 5b in full. Stakeholders were divided into three groups to each provide feedback on one of the scenarios. The final, preferred, scenario was the third alternative, developed by TRUPA. selected by most participants as superior to the other two.

As a spatial concept, the preferred scenario advocates for a preserved park, with very limited development of the River Club, preserving the integrity of the OMEV site and preventing the expansion of BIOVAC. Valkenberg is reduced in size and SKA is located on the SAAO site. The scenario prevents future development in the floodplain, instead allowing for development in areas surrounding the TRUP site such as in the Culembourg or

Woodstock area. The scenario puts emphasis on the development of local jobs and social housing, but that this should take place outside of the green open space in the TRUP site. It emphasises upgrading MGv and ensuring the safety of pedestrians to move around the site. It does not explicitly capture the traditional houses requested by the Western Cape Council of Nguni People and, by its very nature, does not address the objections from the First Nation either.

The preferred scenario was selected because it enjoyed the support of the largest number of participants, and because it was seen as preferable to the alternative two scenarios. This form of participation is useful in some ways, in that it gave participants some decision-making power in selecting the final scenario. However it also had some very serious shortcomings. One was that none of the three scenarios represented the contributions from either the WCCNP or the First Nation. Choosing between three options, when none of them are real options, is not genuine choice. The stakeholders who were able to create their own scenario that uniquely represented their ideas were wealthier and better resourced than other stakeholders.

A second shortcoming of the scenario is that while it disregards the developments proposed by the River Club and BIOVAC, it offers no arguments to support this decision. Given that both the CoCT and WCG representatives who attended the workshops had expressed support for both developments, the preferred scenario does not provide any evidence to convince them otherwise.

An important component of public participation, and public deliberation in particular, is that participants can see their contributions have been taken into account and either incorporated into the final output or responded to adequately where they have been set aside for any reason. Without this, the evidence suggests that participants are likely to feel as though they have no real power in the process and that the process is nothing more than a smoke screen for those with real power. Participants are also likely to feel even more distrustful of future engagements than they would have in the absence any process.

The manifesto, the co-design workshop resource sketchbook and the final preferred scenario encapsulate a lot of material from the TRU(e)-Park process. Crucially, however, the material does not capture the intent and meaning behind the outputs. It ignores the arguments and stories stakeholders put forward. Without this, decision-makers, whether the CoCT, WCG or future private developers, cannot respond adequately to the contributions made by stakeholders.

The WCG, for example, may disagree about whether or not the edges of Valkenberg should be reduced. Without understanding how stakeholders argued for this component of the preferred scenario, the WCG cannot offer arguments against them. Instead, its only option is to unilaterally decide to disregard some aspects of the preferred scenario which they disagree with. Similarly, the WCG may think that the expansion of BIOVAC is a great idea, and be unconvinced of the value of the fire-damaged buildings in the future proposal of the OMEV site. However, presenting reasons to OMEV for this decision, or including caveats such as limits to the expansion of BIOVAC in the future, would go a long way to assuring stakeholders that their contributions have been heard and considered. In order to do this, decision-makers need an understanding of the ideas behind stakeholder's positions and the coalitions relevant to these positions. Argumentative discourse analysis can provide this crucial component necessary for a healthy deliberative democracy

## Chapter 6: Discourses of Change in TRUP

As highlighted in the literature review, Hajer's (2005a) analysis argues that policy issues are often, especially in environmental issues, emblematic of more fundamental conflicts and change in the policy discourse. A central premise of this research is that stakeholders who engaged during the TRU(e)-Park process were also using the development of TRUP as an emblematic issue to discuss broader ideas and values about urban life.

For example, for all the discussion of environmental protection and biodiversity, stakeholders did not mention the drought gripping the city or the future impacts of climate change on rainfall patterns. This dissertation argues that the reference to protecting the floodplains in the TRUP area is not merely a concern for the damage flooding may cause to people or property and cannot be solved by technical knowledge by modelling flooding in the area. If there were a way to allow flooding but still have development in the area, such as through raising buildings on stilts, many participants would still be against this option. The main motivation for limited development is the protection of green open space for its own sake. It is argued that the development in TRUP is therefore an emblematic issue for a broader discussion about the value of green spaces in cities worldwide.

From the argumentative discourse analysis of the TRU(e)-Park process it is evident that the key discourses centred around broader conflicts in urban development. The analysis (Chapter 5) illustrated that different stakeholder groups held either converging or diverging views on a number of topics. These positions collectively tell a story about development at the city scale, its aims, its appropriate forms and the legitimacy of different actors. This analysis confirms that the development of the TRUP site and its precincts acts as an emblematic issue for a discussion of broader disagreements in urban development policy. Argumentative discourse analysis aims first to understand the fundamental differences in opinion beyond the 'emblematic' issue at hand. Second the analysis aims to understand how individual stakeholder groups have formed discourse coalitions around particular discourses.

After categorising the different components of the data according to different approaches, four overarching themes were extracted from the data:

**Table 2: Discourse themes and stakeholder positions**

Theme	Range of stakeholder positions in the theme		
	Position A	Position B	Position C
Green open space	Future development in the area ought to preserve open space. No development in new areas or splitting up or fencing off of areas that used to be open. Green open space is a good in itself	Developments need to go ahead if the area is to reach its potential in line with development goals for the area and the developments under consideration might be able to do that. Not opposed to preserving green space, but need to prioritise housing and service delivery.	Some 'green' space is sterile and not worth preserving. Open space is not valuable in its own right, it is valuable in what it can be used for. Some open space should be used for development because otherwise it is a waste of well-located land



Heritage	History dictates that the authority over the land is not up for debate, and therefore those with historical authority over the land have decision-making power and should be respected. It is not for others to decide how to honour this history	History can be remembered and cultures kept alive in the area with traditional buildings and museums. In this way they can be adequately treasured and represented in the space	Memorialisation is important, but it may be too difficult to do given the multiple dimensions to remembering the history of the land
Densification	Densification should be limited, if not prevented altogether. Other brownfield sites in the city are more suitable to densification and don't require destroying the city's important green lung	This is an opportunity for different communities to live together, some high-rise, some low-rise. But there must be a critical mass of people for that to be possible.	The housing crisis dictates that we must have sufficient levels of density in the area to accommodate housing and service delivery, but in an innovative, sustainable and off-grid manner
Private sector	Private sector is only interested in profit. They cannot be trusted to protect our rivers and open spaces	The private sector is a necessary evil, the city will award development proposals in the area and we must try and limit the damage by giving input into their location and activities	The private sector is what makes cities work; they contribute to vibrant spaces and innovation. We need them to make our cities great and drive investment and job creation

## Discourse Coalitions

Matching stakeholders onto the above themes revealed a number of discourse coalitions. Particular stakeholder groups tended to hold the same perspective or position on a number of topics. Matching the stakeholder groups to particular discourses helped solidify both possible coalitions and helped to make sense of the diverging and converging positions across groups. For a coalition to work, groups do not necessarily need to agree on every aspect of their 'comprehensive doctrine' or every aspect of the overarching discourse that the coalition tends to use. To be considered a coalition in this context, stakeholder groups needed to voice active agreement in the workshops, and to back each other up when confronting a diverging perspective (Hajer, 2005a). And this agreement could not be limited to only one or two key positions but had to give some indication of being indicative of an alignment on more fundamental perspectives. In other words, discourse coalitions are defined as stakeholder groups who employ the same storylines in their discourse, storylines that describe their fundamental beliefs and ideas. Therefore, part of identifying a discourse coalition is identifying and constructing the corresponding storyline around which the coalition converges.

From intimate knowledge of the data and the matching of stakeholder groups and themes it was possible to ascertain and classify three major discourse coalitions and one minor

coalition. The major coalitions are those that were active in the discussion over a number of workshops and themes, whereas minor coalitions are defined as limited to either one or two workshops or only one or two themes. It is possible that minor coalitions are indicative of more entrenched agreement in the coalition, but that was just not explicitly displayed during the workshops. However it may also characterise those coalitions in which stakeholders hold fundamentally diverging opinions on a number of themes that prevents them from forming a closer coalition. For this reason the analysis distinguishes between major and minor discourse coalitions, to indicate the higher degree of interpretation used in the identification of minor discourses and the need for further validation. For each discourse outlined below a brief narrative description has been given of the stories and arguments central to the discourse coalition.

**Table 3: Stakeholder Discourse Coalitions on Urban Development Discourses:**

Discourse Coalition title and members	Storyline(s) employed by discourse coalition members
<p><b>Major Discourse Coalition: Cities as lifestyles</b></p> <p>Stakeholder groups: TRUPA, OMEV, Valkenberg, Robin Trust</p>	<p>Cities are spaces where people can and should aspire to live a lifestyle that is in harmony with nature. This lifestyle can empower individuals to build their communities and small businesses and honour culture and heritage. Achieving this harmonious lifestyle is difficult, but we should look to international examples of how best to do this. Some good examples of this include Central Park in New York and Kirstenbosch in Cape Town. Green space in Cape Town has the potential to be comparable to famous international landmarks such as these. The City's ability to facilitate an aspirational and harmonious lifestyle will attract international recognition and visitors.</p> <p>Green space is a green lung, and is of central importance for the health of the city and its people. It is a limited commodity in the city, and fast disappearing. In order to protect our lifestyles in cities we need to be suspicious of the private sector and land-use in well-located areas where there is still potential to live the lifestyles we aspire to. In particular, high-tech businesses like BIOVAC that deal with vaccines and diseases are not appropriate to be located in the green open space or its surrounding areas. We should instead be supportive of green technology like biodigestors or small-scale renewables. We don't want gates and security to ruin our open space and sense of community by commodifying and corporatizing the communal space. People need open space to connect to nature and one another. The beauty and views in our open space ought to be treasured as precious and vulnerable. And while we should respect heritage, it can be difficult to do and we need to weigh this against development needs.</p> <p>We need to put up strong boundaries to protect green space and to fight back the tide of development threatening to swallow it. Soon TRUP will be in the centre of the city and it will be the only green space left. Private developers and government won't protect the green space unless we, the residents of the city, stand up for it ourselves. At its core, the driving force behind cities is its people through social entrepreneurship and ground-up initiatives, and in order to understand an area and its value and potential you have to ask those who live and work there. Government are just custodians of our land, and their roles is to support the work already being done by people and communities on the ground. We need to keep an eye on government to ensure they</p>

	<p>do not concede too easily to the private sector. Public-private partnerships are sometimes just another way to give away public land to big business. Our government isn't doing development right, and instead we should take care of the land ourselves, as we too are custodians of it. We should stand up for how we want to run our businesses and communities. Government should support us to do this for ourselves, rather than get in our way.</p>
<p><b>Major Discourse Coalition: Cities as built by private enterprises</b></p> <p>Stakeholder groups: The River Club, SKA, BIOVAC,</p>	<p>Cities are too big, complicated and expensive to be built and shaped centrally by government. Instead, it is the private sector that is the driving force behind how cities develop and whether they thrive and attract jobs and investment. Cities need significant amounts of investment and increasingly need to compete with international competition to keep local skills and drive local employment. They need to be world class, and make a name for themselves on the international stage. Cities need the private sector, for better or for worse. We, as stakeholders, have to work with them to build our cities in the best way possible, harnessing their potential and helping them to succeed.</p> <p>Land is limited in the city, and we should be using as much of it as we can for much needed development. Some green open space is in fact sterile, and doesn't need to be protected. We can sacrifice this for development gains, both for the private sector and for the residents of cities. Private developments have the potential to meet the objectives of communities and people while also satisfying the profit motive. Developers, such as the River Club, have put in a lot of thought and energy into aligning their development with the needs of the surrounding areas and people of Cape Town in an innovative, world class way. Residents and civic organisations should work with the private sector to help realise their developments and maximise the benefits they can bring. Government needs to recognise the growth and potential private developers are offering, not stifle this potential.</p>
<p><b>Major Discourse Coalition: Cities as services</b></p> <p>Stakeholder groups: MGTV, Western Cape Council of Nguni People, Valkenberg, Robin Trust</p>	<p>People need basic services like housing, sanitation, health, safety and employment. The opportunity (and responsibility) of cities is to provide people with their basic needs. So far they are not living up to that responsibility because governments, businesses and wealthier residents are chasing more aspirational goals for the city whilst forgetting about their basic responsibility. Government is primarily responsible for providing basic services, and if they need the private sector to play a part so be it. However government must still be held accountable for service delivery and for communicating with residents. Communities simultaneously mistrust government and feel let down by their mistreatment and neglect.</p> <p>It is the role of communities and civil society to fight back, to hold government to account, to use their power.</p> <p>Its all very well to say, "listen to the river", which may be a beautiful sentiment, but in the meantime no one is listening to the people. And our primary needs are housing and jobs, not beautiful buildings and views of the mountain. Cities are supposed to care for those who live in them. They are supposed to be places of healing, safety and community. While we still do not have these things for everyone in the</p>

	<p>city, aspirational or aesthetic concerns like beautiful buildings and views, must be a secondary concern.</p> <p>Local knowledge of the area is as important as professional inputs, and planners and developers need to listen to the residents of an area on this.</p> <p>Cities must protect the vulnerable, and this is primarily government's responsibility to ensure this. But where government has fallen short one can see individuals and communities who have taken on this burden themselves. However it is still primarily government's responsibility.</p> <p>Big business developments like that of BIOVAC may be good for the country's economic development and international recognition but don't directly benefit the people who live in the area where they are located, and that should be a primary concern- to ensure that local residents are not forgotten about in the face of broader socio-economic or environmental challenges.</p>
<p><b>Minor Discourse Coalition: Cities as a history of dispossession</b></p> <p>Stakeholder groups: First Nation, Western Cape Council of Nguni People, MGV</p>	<p>Cities were, and continue to be, sites of dispossession and injustice in South Africa. Not much has changed since the advent of democracy, only the nature of the dispossession. Injustices of the past have still not been addressed and instead further displacement is occurring.</p> <p>Knowledge of history is not found in history books or professional reports. If you want to know about history you need to talk to those who represent that history in the area and their voice has more authority than any academic inputs.</p> <p>As people, our heritage, our families and our memories and sense of connection are linked to physical place. We don't forget about growing up in an area. Years later that place will still hold meaning for us.</p> <p>Cities, no matter how high-tech or smart, will still fundamentally be places where people live and remain connected to physical places. Development, in whatever form it takes, needs to honour this, and allow residents to achieve a better quality of life without disrupting their sense of place.</p>

## Testing the literature on power and dominant discourses

As outlined earlier, Hajer (2005a) defines a discourse coalition as dominating a given space if two conditions hold: discourse structuration, where central actors are persuaded by, or forced to accept, the rhetorical power of a new discourse and; discourse institutionalization, where the discourse is reflected in the institutional practices of that political domain.

In the case of TRUP there is evidence of discourse structuration where a number of stakeholders, including SUN Development, took on board the discourse put forward by OMEV and TRUPA around the role of different stakeholders in the public participation process, the value of a green lung and "no-go" areas for development. This is evidenced by the fact that SUN Development began to use specific terms like "co-custodians", "no-go areas" and other indicators of the discourse used by OMEV and others. Even in arguments, SUN Development conceded to some of the arguments made by OMEV participants around the value of the development in OMEV, the limiting of the Valkenberg perimeter and the locating of SKA in the SAAO site. This is evidence of discourse structuration of the "cities as

lifestyles” discourse, at least in part. One could further argue that some aspects of the discourse have been institutionalised by the fact that the workshops were extended, and that the stakeholders who were invited to present at future workshops were done so at the request of stakeholders from the “cities as lifestyles” coalition. SUN Development even changed their graphic representation of the process to reflect the more primary role of participants and downgrade the authority of professional experts and government. However, this is not enough to conclusively say that the discourse has been institutionalised, but merely that components of the discourse have been incorporated.

However, while SUN Development is a central decision-maker in the TRU(e)-Park process, they are subcontractors to the WCG and CoCT and have no power to approve or deny development proposals for the TRUP site. Their process will offer recommendations to government, however decision-making power remains that of government and no promises were made during the process that government would respond to these recommendations in any particular way. For this reason, the definition of power in argumentative discourse analysis is incomplete. If the institutional practices that reflect the discourse still do not have decision-making power over the TRUP site’s development then any power of this nature will be dampened. For example, discourse from the TRU(e)-Park process may be taken up by some programmes within the WCG, but if this does not translate into influencing the developments in TRUP then an important dimension of the definition of power is missing: whether or not a discourse effects how policy is implemented.

There is evidence of OMEV and TRUPA taking on the terminology and discourse used by other participants such as that of SUN Developments use of co-design as a concept and tool and the discourse presented by MGTV on exclusion, memory and service delivery. However in analysing for positioning effects it is not clear if this is a case of discourse structuration or if OMEV and TRUPA were merely trying to position themselves as ‘friendly’ to these discourses while still maintaining the core of their own position. Especially as the role of TRUPA is to represent multiple stakeholders in the TRUP site, their occasional reference to discourse used by MGTV may be tokenistic in nature and not indicative of any power the discourse holds over them. This is a weakness in the definition Hajer proposes. It is easy for stakeholders to adopt discourses at a particular time for strategic reasons, in the hope of ‘winning over’ the other side, not necessarily because stakeholders intend to adopt that discourse going forward. Hajer’s definition does not allow one to differentiate between when a discourse is used by stakeholders for instrumental reasons and when stakeholders use a discourse because they are convinced by it.

### **Testing the literature on public deliberation for increased cooperation and understanding**

Over the course of a year the same group of organisations met thirteen times. In order to examine whether or not the deliberative process produced greater understanding the analysis recorded recurring disagreements. Disagreements that were raised early in the process, responded to and then laid to rest are likely candidates for examples where new understanding or cooperation was built. Conversely, disagreements that were raised again and again are likely to represent arguments that remain unresolved, despite public deliberation.

The analysis found a number of disagreements that appear to have been resolved, at least superficially, during the workshop process. The first is on the role of different parties in the process. From the first meeting, participants from multiple groups raised concern at the rushed nature of the process and the lack of participation from a wider audience. Specifically, OMEV and TRUPA argued that the professional experts were given too much authority in decisions about the TRUP area. They argued that the professional experts were

there to present information and relevant data to stakeholders so that stakeholders may make informed decisions. This conflict arose in the first workshop, and again in the fourth. After this, SUN Development changed their diagram to place the role of the professional team below that of stakeholders and government. Stakeholders expressed satisfaction at these changes and the conflict was not raised again.

Another example is the development of Valkenberg's Hospital Revitalisation Plan. Stakeholders initially raised concerns that Valkenberg is not well located in the TRUP area, that it disrupts the green space and should rather be located on the outskirts of the city. Katherine Bleazard, on behalf of the hospital, responded that the hospital has been located on that site for more than a hundred years and it has a history there. She argued it was not fair that the mentally ill be banished to the outskirts of society rather than being in an accessible, central location. The CoCT argued that the site is large enough to accommodate Valkenberg without losing the green open space. Stakeholders suggested a compromise where the perimeter of Valkenberg should allow for pedestrians to walk around it. The discussion of whether Valkenberg should continue to be located in the site was put to rest and any new discussions about it were limited to how to manage its perimeter.

However, there was also evidence that some disagreements were not resolved and were instead raised repeatedly. Examples include disagreements about the development at the River Club and the expansion of BIOVAC into OMEV. Stakeholder objections to the developments did not dampen with repeated engagement on the topic. It is possible that polarisation, which the literature raises as a concern for some public deliberation, occurred.

Policies, in this research, are understood to be statements about what the problem is, and what the legitimate solutions are. Often language in policy documents is designed to smooth over disagreements in the presentation of potential solutions. This research has instead highlighted disagreements so that they may be addressed in the policy-making process. While final policy documents don't often explain the nuances behind their development, their legitimacy depends upon stakeholders feeling that their disagreements have been addressed. Processes that only produce outputs like that of the manifesto or the preferred scenario neglect this important step in policy-making. This research has argued that the value of the TRU(e)-Park process is in the way different stakeholders were able to voice their disagreements, argue for their position, and learn from one another. In some cases, the data suggest that the process has produced new understanding and some stakeholders may have been convinced of the arguments of others. However, on some occasions stakeholders remained opposed to each other's views. Perhaps this is only the beginning of longer public deliberation that will play out over many years as developments are planned in the TRUP site and other sites in the City of Cape Town. The process has already achieved a few cases of new understanding and cooperation amongst stakeholders, but its continuing success is dependent on stakeholders continuing to feel heard and acknowledged.

## Chapter 7: Conclusion

Harnessing the explanatory power of discourse to understand conflict and change in society continues to be a promising and daunting research endeavour. It is crucial to understand the relationship between language, power and ideas if we hope to build more resilient, participatory and just cities. The central task of this research has been to follow, document, analyse and make sense of a year-long public participation process for the Two Rivers Urban Park development in Cape Town. The research translated the multiple and varied contributions from stakeholders into a meaningful and yet digestible contribution to the policy-making process for TRUP. It argues that in order to respond to processes of this nature appropriately, one must first understand how the stories, arguments and other stakeholder contributions fit together to form comprehensive discourses, around which particular stakeholders converge or diverge from one another. It has also been an opportunity to test the literature available on public deliberation and to compare and contrast different approaches to analysing the data collected.

The literature presented in this research begins with political philosophy: Rawls and Habermas argue that is the responsibility of governments and citizens to engage with public reasons and public deliberation when making policy decisions. The empirical literature surveyed supports the claim that public participation has the potential to enhance development outcomes, and can result in a more accountable form of governance, enhanced civic participation, and greater inclusion of local knowledge.

However, public participation also has the potential to frustrate and alienate participants. In order to achieve the positive impact of public participation, participation processes must be fair, legitimate and allow for participants to justify their different positions to one another without coercion or power imbalances. Participants will only accept an outcome that differs from their preference if they believe the process by which that outcome was achieved was fair and can see how their contribution to it has been acknowledged and responded to by decision-makers. Public deliberation remains a unique opportunity for government to engage meaningfully with stakeholders and public opinion on value-laden topics, particularly with developments that involve affordable housing or green-fields development.

While the literature can provide guidance for what may or may not work, deliberative participation is highly context-specific and each case is likely to face its own challenges and opportunities. The value of case studies such as TRUP is to explore, in a specific case, the outcomes of public deliberation and their value for the policy-making process.

The challenge for urban policy-makers is to marry the ideals, which Rawls and Habermas espouse, with the messy and resource-constrained realities policy must respond to. The role of policy is to take, as Simone (2014: 251) says, “all of the different stories being told about why water, power, land, politics, buildings, transport, money, and people act the way they do and draw creative lines of conjunction among them”.

Understanding these storylines requires an understanding of the use of language and discourse. Given the nature of the content of the TRU(e)-Park process, the research focuses on the Argumentative Turn in Policy and Planning literature. The nature of the data collected from the TRU(e)-Park process required a framework that could relate the language that stakeholders used to comprehensive doctrines, coalitions, power dynamics and different perspectives between coalitions in a particular social context.

Argumentative discourse analysis works with storylines, metaphors and argumentation to provide an analysis of conflict and change in policy. Understanding policy change is

therefore a function of understanding dominant discourses in policy debates. Argumentative discourse analysis defines dominant discourses in two ways. A discourse dominates a given political space if other stakeholders are persuaded by it (discourse structuration) and if the policy process is conducted according to the ideas of a given discourse (discourse institutionalization).

Argumentative discourse analysis provides a theory and method by which to analyse the case of TRUP as an emblematic issue, indicative of more fundamental conflicts in policy narratives about urban development. In applying this approach, in conjunction with the Discourse Coalition Theory, the research follows the analysis of Maarten Hajer who argues that policy issues are often, especially in environmental issues, emblematic of more fundamental conflicts and change in the policy discourse (Hajer, 2005a). The purpose of discourse coalition analysis is to find ways of relating the analysis of the discursive production of reality with the analysis of the social practices from which social constructs emerge.

The starting point of this research was to understand how participants in the TRU(e)-Park process understand and experience life in their urban location, and how they communicate their experiences and beliefs through language. Argumentative discourse analysis provides the researcher with tools to understand the use of language in communicating and reproducing power, value, ideology and identity.

To realise the aims of Habermas and Rawls, decision-makers need to be able to engage with public reasons. In other words decision-makers need to respond to the specific arguments raised, themes discussed and stories told by the participants who are subject to their decisions. The first step is to understand what those arguments, themes and stories mean for policy development. Analysing the data collected from public participation is difficult and time consuming because of the volume of data and the range of different ways in which stakeholders choose to contribute to a process such as TRU(e)-Park. Critically examining a potentially effective and meaningful way to do this is the primary aim of this research.

In the case of TRUP, the challenge for policy-makers and researchers is to take a group discussion, which includes inputs from stakeholders in line with their individual comprehensive doctrines, and create an output that is (a) understood by each stakeholder in relation to their comprehensive doctrine (b) recognised as a legitimate outcome of the process and (c) offers reasons to those stakeholders whose comprehensive doctrine is not accommodated by the outcome. This research took a first step towards achieving this end by providing an analysis of the discourses and coalitions, their ideological narrative and membership. It further argues that the current outputs from the TRU(e)-Park process are unable to provide this crucial step in the policy development process.

The research involved the detailed collection of audio recordings and transcriptions over one year's worth of meetings. It has closely and thoroughly analysed the language deployed by stakeholders over the course of this year, contextualised within a particular social practice.

The relative freedom that participants enjoyed when presenting a contribution of their choice at the workshops meant that the data collected was varied and rich in content. There are therefore multiple ways to analyse the data, each of which emphasise different aspects of it. This research focused on a number of different categories of analysis so as to comprehensively understand the content. The analysis tested the different categories of the theory against the data, including the use of metaphors, storylines and arguments. A



number of themes and discourse coalitions were distilled from the data during iterative analysis.

The outcome of the analysis was the identification and development of three major discourse coalitions and one minor one. Each discourse tells a different story about the nature of urban development, foregrounds a different challenge, and proposes diverging solutions. The discourses are more than a collection of diverging views on the role of the private sector, history and green spaces in our cities. They are fundamentally different stories about what urban development ought to prioritise and how. They are different stories about what growing cities mean to different people, and they reflect the different experiences and comprehensive doctrines of the groups who employ them.

Understanding the root of these differences can allow policy makers to engage with them, perhaps even change them. However their primary use is to create greater understanding and empathy between decision-makers and stakeholders. Understanding the discourses employed in the discussion of specific proposals for the TRUP area is crucial if government intends to respond to stakeholders in a manner stakeholders will find satisfactory. The discourse analysis provides decision-makers with insight into where compromise and change is possible within the discourse and where it is not. For example, stakeholders may be able to accept the expansion of BIOVAC if pre-agreed limits are applied to any expansion in the future, or they may welcome the inclusion of the SKA in the TRUP site so long as it is incorporated into the SAAO precinct. Highlighted conflicts that will be more difficult to resolve include the First Nation's rejection of the entire development proposal and the River Club's position that the green open space in its precinct is not worth preserving. These insights can guide decision-makers in their approach to further engagement with stakeholders.

The analysis further examined whether the literature on power and discourse is valid in the case of TRUP. According to the definition provided by Hajer, the identified discourses were successful in achieving power in some instances and not others. However, the definition that Hajer provides is unable to deal with instances in which discourses appear to have been adopted by others for strategic reasons, unrelated to their rhetorical power. Furthermore, a discussion about the power of discourse in TRU(e)-Park seems meaningless unless there is evidence that one or more of the discourses have influenced practice beyond the workshops. Since there has been little to no further activity by government decision-makers on the topic of development in TRUP, it is not yet possible to evaluate this.

Instead, a more insightful indicator of power could be determined later when the process is solidified into policy and then implementation. If some discourses are institutionalised in the local spatial development framework, this will signify power, and may be at the expense of groups who were not able to participate in the meetings, or not in the same numbers.

This research demonstrates that the development of TRUP is more than merely a technical discussion of how to accommodate the 100-year flood plain or how to accommodate the interests of a diverse range of stakeholder groups. The metaphors, stories and arguments used by participants to discuss the development of TRUP place the development within the bigger picture of the city, its history, the history of South Africa and global socio-economic systems.

SUN Development's manifesto and the preferred scenario do not engage with the arguments or stories behind their content. They provide only the outcomes of these reasons to decision-makers and so do not allow space for engagement with public reasons. The

research demonstrates that the TRU(e)-Park outputs were inadequate because (1) stories, metaphors and even many of the arguments were not captured by the process in a manner that could be accessible to decision-makers; (2) they failed to capture the differences between stakeholder groups but instead captured only generic statements that all stakeholders could agree to and; (3) they did not examine the broader discourses around the legitimate objectives and role of different actors in urban development.

A longer-term aim of this research is to develop and test a framework for how public participation, where it includes argumentative discourse and narratives, can be analysed to feed into policy making. The framework would consist of the categories for analysis and aim to highlight the kinds of information that should be captured and steps for carrying out such analysis. The key value of analysis of this nature is that it moves beyond a mere discussion of interests and allows the analyst to examine the ideas and beliefs behind key positions that groups may take, and understand why some positions are subject to change and others are more resistant to argument and persuasion.

A research agenda for public participation in Cape Town (and other cities) would include further research questions such as:

1. How does one adequately validate research of this nature with stakeholders?
2. How do we connect the different sites of participation happening across the city, and other cities? Are there similar themes being discussed in Reclaim The City meetings or in conferences at UCT's African Centre for Cities? Mapping participation sites, discourse coalitions and arguments could present a snapshot of the city's debates at different points in time and could map changes in discourse at a macro level.
3. How does change happen after the analysis? Does the analysis produce change of its own, in changing people's minds or providing more clarity for policy-makers on the key contributions?
4. Do policy-makers respond better when presented with better outputs? Are there other barriers, such as time, will, political sensitivity or others, which prevent policy-makers from acting on this data?

What the TRUP case study has shown is the high degree of complexity in the content and form of stakeholder contributions to the planning process. Contributions can provide insights into different perspectives on how people interact in cities, what the role of cities in development is, what an ideal city would be, what the most important problems are and what the legitimate role of different actors is in tackling those problems. As cities around the world begin to take on greater responsibility locally and on the international stage, requiring coordination and cooperation among networks of cities, the ability of researchers to understand public participation within the city will become increasingly important. The power of public participation is often difficult to harness, and doing so is time consuming. However it has at its core an alluring promise of being able to deliver more legitimate governance, more stable and successful cities, and better-informed, more empowered individuals and organisations.

## References

- Barber, B. (1984). *Strong Democracy*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Bettencourt, B., & Dorr, N. (1998). Cooperative Interaction and Intergroup Bias: Effects of Numerical Representation and Cross-cut Role Assignment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 14, 1276–1293.
- Chambers, S. (1996). *Reasonable Democracy*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- City of Cape Town. (2013). *Urban Design Policy 12986*. Cape Town, Western Cape: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/urban\\_design\\_-\\_policy\\_number\\_12986\\_approved\\_on\\_04\\_december\\_2013.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/urban_design_-_policy_number_12986_approved_on_04_december_2013.pdf).
- City of Cape Town. (2017). *Cape Town Municipal Spatial Development Framework (MSDF) Draft 2017-2022*. Cape Town, Western Cape: Author. Retrieved from [http://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies%2C%20plans%20and%20frameworks/HYS\\_Draft\\_Municipal\\_Spatial\\_Development\\_Framework%202017%20-%202022.pdf](http://resource.capetown.gov.za/documentcentre/Documents/City%20strategies%2C%20plans%20and%20frameworks/HYS_Draft_Municipal_Spatial_Development_Framework%202017%20-%202022.pdf).
- Crawford, C. (2017). Density, Affordable Housing and Social Inclusion: A Modest Proposal for Cape Town. *Journal of Comparative Urban Law and Policy*, 1(1), 7.
- Dentlinger, L. (2016). *River Club Proposal Concerns Residents*. Independent Online, 18 August. Retrieved from <https://www.iol.co.za/>.
- Fischer, F. & Forester, J. (Eds.). (1993). *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Fischer, F. & Gottweis, H. (Eds.). (2012). *The argumentative turn revisited: Public policy as communicative practice*. North Carolina: Duke University Press.
- Gastil, J. (2000). *By Popular Demand: Revitalizing Representative Democracy Through Deliberative Elections*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Grobicki, A. (2001). Urban Catchment Management in a Developing Country: the Lotus River project, Cape Town, South Africa. *Water Science and Technology*, 44(2-3), 313-319.
- Gutmann, A. & Thompson, D. (1996). *Democracy and Disagreement: Why Moral Conflict Cannot Be Avoided in Politics, and What Can Be Done About It*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1995). Reconciliation Through the Public Use of Reason: Remarks on John Rawls's Political Liberalism. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 92(3), 109-131.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hajer, M. (1993). Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Britain. In F. Fisher & F. Forester (Eds.) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning* (43-76). Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Hajer, M. (1995a). Acid Rain in Great Britain: Environmental Discourse and the Hidden Politics of Institutional Practice. In Fischer F. & Black M. (Eds) *Greening Environmental Policy* (145-164). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hajer, M. (1995b). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Hajer, M. (2005a). Coalitions, Practices, and Meaning in Environmental Politics: From Acid Rain to BSE. In D. Howarth & J. Torfing (Eds.), *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy and Governance* (297-315). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hajer, M. (2005b). Rebuilding Ground Zero. The Politics of Performance. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 6(4), 445-464.

Hajer, M. & Laws, D. (2006). Ordering Through Discourse. In R. Goodwin, M. Moran & M. Rein (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Public Policy* (251-268). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawkesworth, M. (2012). From Policy Frames to Discursive Politics: Feminist Approaches to Development Policy and Planning in an Era of Globalization. In F. Fischer & H. Gottweis (Eds.), *The Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice* (114-148). Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Jørgensen, M. W. & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE.

Klugman, K. (2017). *New Shot at Life for Africa's Babies*. News 24, 14 May. Retrieved from <https://www.news24.com>

Mazel, A. D., & Stewart, P. (1987). Meddling with the Mind: The Treatment of San Hunter-Gatherers and the Origins of South Africa's Black Population in Recent South African School History Textbooks. *South African Archaeological Bulletin*, 42, 166-170.

McCarthy, T. (1994). Kantian Constructivism and Reconstructivism: Rawls and Habermas in Dialogue. *Ethics*, 105(1), 44-63.

Melanie Attwell and Associates, & Arcon Heritage and Design. (2016). *Draft for Discussion: Two Rivers Urban Park Cape Town Baseline Heritage Study: Including erven Oude Molen Erf 26439 RE Alexandra Erf 24290 RE Valkenburg Erf 26439 RE, erven 118877, 160695 The Observatory erf 26423-0-1 River Club erf 151832 Ndabeni Erf 103659-0-2 RE*. Cape Town, Western Cape: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/files/hia\\_reduced\\_0.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/files/hia_reduced_0.pdf).

Mendelberg, T. (2002) *Research in Micropolitics: Political Decisionmaking, Deliberation and Participation* (Vol. 6). Greenwich, Connecticut: JAI Press.

Merten, M. (2016). City of Cape Town Owns 24,000 Parcels of Land, Deputy Mayor Reveals in Election Debate. *The Daily Maverick (Johannesburg)*, 19 July. Retrieved from <https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/>.

Ministry of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs. (2016). *Integrated Urban Development Framework*. Cape Town, Western Cape: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/iudf-2016\\_web.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/iudf-2016_web.pdf).

Mitchell, F. (2012). Khoisan Identity. *South African History Online*, 10 May. Retrieved from <http://www.sahistory.org.za/>.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation Development, African Development Bank & United Nations Development Programme. (2016). *African Economic Outlook 2016: Sustainable Cities and Structural Transformation*. Paris: OECD.

Oude Molen Eco Village Tenants Association. (2016). *Oude Molen Eco Village Future Development Proposal [Powerpoint presentation]*. Retrieved from Cape Town, South Africa: [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/oude\\_molen\\_eco\\_village.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/oude_molen_eco_village.pdf)

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Individual and Social Psychology*. London: Routledge.

Pieterse, E., Parnell, S., & Haysom, G. (2015). Towards an African Urban Agenda. *UN-Habitat and Economic Commission for Africa*. Nairobi: UN Habitat.

Rawls, J. (1996). *Political Liberalism [1993]*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rawls, J. (1997). The Idea of Public Reason Revisited. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 64(3), 765-807.

Rogers, D., McAuliffe, C., Piracha, A., & Schatz, L. (2017). *Resident Involvement in Urban Development in Sydney: The New Politics of the City*. Sydney, New South Wales: University of Sydney Press. Retrieved from [http://usyd.nikashsingh.com/hht/2017\\_ROGERS\\_ResidentInvolvement\\_lowres.pdf](http://usyd.nikashsingh.com/hht/2017_ROGERS_ResidentInvolvement_lowres.pdf).

Sabatier, P. A. and Jenkins-Smith, H. C. (1993). *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Saunders, C. (1979). The Creation of Ndabeni: Urban Segregation and African Resistance in Cape Town. *Studies in the History of Cape Town*, 1, 165-193.

Schkade, D., Sunstein, C., & Kahneman, D. (2000). Deliberating About Dollars: The Severity Shift. *Columbia Law Review* (100), 1139–1175.

Simone, A. (2014). *Jakarta: Drawing The City Near*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stone, D. (2002). *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making (Rev. ed.)*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Western Cape Government. (2010). *Cape Town Central City Regeneration Programme Strategic Framework*. Cape Town, Western Cape: Author. Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/text/2011/10/cc\\_regenerationprog.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/text/2011/10/cc_regenerationprog.pdf).

Western Cape Government. (2015). *Invitation to Tender: Provision of Professional Services to undertake Urban Planning, Landscape Architecture, Engineering, Environmental and Heritage Studies for the Two Rivers Urban Park (TRUP) Project, Cape Town*. (S174/14). Cape Town, Western Cape: Author Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/wcg\\_tender\\_document\\_s174\\_14.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/assets/departments/transport-public-works/Documents/wcg_tender_document_s174_14.pdf).

Western Cape Government. (2016). *Two Rivers Urban Park Draft Baseline Heritage Assessment* [Powerpoint Presentation to TRU(e)-Park Participants on 10 November 2016]. Retrieved from [https://www.westerncape.gov.za/files/161110\\_trup\\_stakeholder\\_presentation\\_hia\\_baseline.pdf](https://www.westerncape.gov.za/files/161110_trup_stakeholder_presentation_hia_baseline.pdf).

Wolf, R. (2015, December 9). Khoisan Leadership Demands Proper Recognition. *Independent Online*. Retrieved from <https://www.iol.co.za/>.

World Bank. (2016). *East Asia's Changing Urban Landscape : Measuring a Decade of Spatial Growth*. Washinton, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/467661468248692758/East-Asias-changing-urban-landscape-measuring-a-decade-of-spatial-growth>.

World Design Capital. (2014). Oude Molen Eco Village #WDC387. *World Design Capital Cape Town*. Retrieved from <http://www.wdccapetown2014.com/>.